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WebEx Meeting  
Access information provided to Internal Staff

Public Participant Dialing Instructions  
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Assure a safe community for people

1. Approval of June 18, 2020 Draft Minutes          Council Member Hiltz
2. Consent Items
3. Independent Investigation Update             City Manager Twombly  
                                           Council Member Hiltz
4. Disciplinary Process including Grievance Process  
                                           Deputy Chief Harry Glidden
5. Use of Force Policy and Training Follow-up  
                                           Division Chief Lee Condreay  
                                           Commander Marcus Dudley
6. Veterans Court Resolution  
7. Miscellaneous Matters for Consideration
8. Confirm Next Meeting                         Council Member Hiltz

Next Meeting: 7/30/2020 @ 11am – TBD
PUBLIC SAFETY, COURTS & CIVIL SERVICE MEETING  
JUNE 18, 2020

Members Present:  Council Member Allison Hiltz, Chair  
Council Member Curtis Gardner, Vice Chair  
Council Member Angela Lawson, Member  
Mayor Pro Tem Nicole Johnston  
Council Member Alison Coombs  
Council Member Dave Gruber  
Council Member Juan Marcano


REVIEW/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

May minutes approved and signed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

CONSENT ITEMS

None.

ISO UPDATE

Summary of Issue and Discussion
Fire Commander Allen Robnett provided an updated on the ISO Public Protection Classification to the committee. It had been quite some time since the last evaluation of the ISO status. Chief Gray met with ISO Examiner Brian Nichols in October 2017 to discuss the analysis of the community and steps to move forward with acquiring a new classification. The official engagement began in January 2020. AFR capabilities accounts for 50% of the total classification, water supply accounts for 40%, and emergency communications accounts for the remaining 10%. AFR received 42.9 points, water supply received 39.38 points and E-communications received 9.63 points. All were exceptionally high for a total of 93.78 out of 105.5 points. AFR is rated as a 1/1X and only 388 communities have received such a designation and only 80 of those are accredited. Because the water supply received such high score, AFR points were adjusted to balance out the scores. Additionally, bonus points were added for the community risk reduction programs which include code enforcement combined with public safety education and fire investigations programs.

CM Hiltz congratulated AFR for their successful reclassification and all the work that went into acquiring it. CM Gardner also congratulated the group adding the scores speak to how effective AFR is. Chief Gray thanked council and city management for their support. And added that the score reflects the hard work of
the public safety dispatchers and water department as well. This is not just an award to AFR but for the whole community.

**Outcome**
Information Only.

**Follow-up Action**
None.

---

**TECHNICAL RESCUE TEAMS**

**Summary of Issue and Discussion**
Fire Battalion Chief Scott Mills presented this item update to the committee. Technical Rescue Team (TRT) is just one of five special operations programs. The vision of the AFR TRT is to increase the capability and effectiveness of the AFR response plan and enable accomplishment of the department’s overall mission. TRT began in 1989 at Station 6 as a High Angle Rescue Team (HART), which focused on rope rescue training, equipment and response. HART evolved in 1992 and expanded to include heavy rescue apparatus and team members were selected. TRT went in service at Station 8 in January 1993 and was staffed by four full-time personnel each day until 2002. In 2002 it was replaced by a truck company and cross-staffed. TRT moved to Station 5 in January 2020. TRT areas of operations include confined space rescue, heavy vehicle and machinery extrication, ice rescue, rope rescue, structural collapse rescue, swift water rescue, and trench rescue. There were 79 TRT responses in 2019.

Training costs for TRT includes an initial, 11-day course. Through 2017 trainees were sent to West Metro Fire Rescue for the course at $1600 per student. This limited the amount of people that could receive the training to 2-4 students per year. AFR started teaching their own courses in 2018 and have put 30 people through the training at $810 initially and then $725 per student. A brief video was played for the attendees showing off the equipment available to the team and photos were provided for the different types of rescues and equipment used.

Some issues and operational concerns include maintaining the high level of training and skill, maintain or increase the daily minimum staff of six with a goal of eight per day, establish an equipment replacement schedule, adequate budget support to ensure program sustainability, and ability to adapt to the growth of the city. Minimum staffing for TRT includes one rescue operations officer, one safety officer, two for the entry team, two back up team, one air supply, and one communications officer for a total of eight staff. Next steps for TRT include development of an operations manual to ensure consistency in training and operations, apparatus replacements, updated equipment, increase trained members, increase daily staffing to eight, and establish internal trainers in all areas of operation to maintain training levels.

AFR is one of 28 agencies that are involved in Colorado Task Force 1 (CO-TF1) and has been since the 1990’s. There are currently five AFR members on CO-TF1 that include one incident support team member, one search team manager, one hazmat team manager, one hazmat specialist, and one communications specialist.

CM Hiltz asked why the fulltime staffing was removed and is it possible to move it back. Of the three major cities, Aurora was the only one without fulltime TRT staffing and she wonders what would happen if there are two calls when it’s cross-staffed. BC Mills explained all special operations apparatus are cross-staffed at this time and the reason for the change in 2002 was to put an additional truck company in service. There wasn’t funding at the time for another truck company, so staff ordered an aerial apparatus and put the crew from heavy rescue on the truck company. CM Hiltz would like to continue that conversation with council.
moving forward.

**Outcome**
Information Only.

**Follow-up Action**
None.

---

**USE OF FORCE POLICY & TRAINING**

**Summary of Issue and Discussion**
CM Hiltz explained before the presentation that this item did have a time limit for presentation and discussion. Questions would be held until after the presentation starting with Committee members and then other Council Members could ask their questions as time allows. This item can be brought back to a future meeting for more discussion if needed.

Division Chief Lee Condreay and Commander Marcus Dudley presented this item to the Committee. Questions were provided to Staff for response for this presentation. DC Condreay explained he took those questions, combined similar ones and provided responses in the presentation.

The De-Escalation policy is under the Use of Force Directive 5.3 and states; When practicable officers will attempt to de-escalate their use of force and/or the situation so that lesser force, or possible no force, is required. DC Condreay noted this has been the practice for many years and is incorporated into various trainings. APD’s Use of Force Continuum requires officers to constantly assess the situation and options to handle the situation as peacefully and non-confrontational as possible.

Chokeholds and Strangleholds has never been allowed by APD. Prior to June 9, 2020, the carotid control hold was allowed, which is compression of the sides of the neck, restricting oxygenated blood flow to the brain resulting in incapacitating the person for a short period of time.

APD has trained with firearms and less lethal options to give verbal warnings, if possible, for decades. As of June 9, 2020, directives have been written that states; The officer must identify himself/herself as an officer and give a clear verbal warning of the intent to shoot with sufficient time for the warning to be observed unless doing so would place the officer(s) at risk of injury, create a risk of death or injury to others, or would be clearly inappropriate or ineffective under the circumstances.

State law that requires officers report the use of excessive force. In anticipation of SB 217, APD has proactively incorporated a directive outlining mandates to intervene. As of June 9, 2020, any sworn member who, while acting in his/her official capacity as a law enforcement officer, witnesses another member (regardless of rank or tenure) acting in his/her official capacity, use force that is clearly beyond that which is objectively reasonable, and lawful, given the totality of the circumstances shall, when in a position to do so, safely and immediately intervene to prevent and/or discontinue the use of force. DC Condreay noted that this directive is to protect community members and officers to help each other having a duty to intervene when someone gets emotionally charged.

APD has always gone above and beyond the minimum requirements of POST. Training on the front end seems to eliminate issues that come up late. Many of the hours are in the classroom and then incorporated and reinforced in the training. Scenario based training puts all the skills learned in action and is reinforced every year in mandatory in-service training.

There is not, technically, a procedure to remove someone based on a complaint. Those decisions are made
on a case-by-case basis. However, if the member is involved in a Tier-3 Use of Force, critical incident, they are put on administrative leave with pay for a period of time while the incident is investigated, and the member must go through steps to return as defined in Directive 2.08.11.

In response to the question about permitted tactics on handcuffed parties, DC Condreay explained a handcuffed person can still cause harm to officers. Officers’ actions will still be based on the threat that the person presents. When someone is just strictly handcuffed and compliant there is not a pain compliance technique or use of force used. APD Directive 5.3 refers to CRS Statutes 18-1-704 and 18-1-707.

No-Knock warrants usually begin with the investigator and district attorney. They are reviewed by a Chief DA and then approved by a judge. They consider two factors in their determination; the likelihood of evidence being destroyed, and the likelihood that the occupants are armed and the likelihood they will utilize their weapons. APD rarely utilizes No-Knock warrants and in 2019 only used two and to date in 2020 there have been four. Of those six, only two that were executed as a traditional no-knock where officers enter without announcing themselves. The other four were executed as an order-out process. Officer’s open the door, stand outside the door and announce they are the police and want the occupants to come out with their hands up, which is considered to be a safer process.

The use of “quasi-military” equipment by APD was interpreted as rifles and armored vehicles. There is a number of officers trained to use long rifles. There is a directive that limits when they use it and the training required to use it. These would not be deployed on routine calls. Most likely would be used in active shooter situations or where there are multiple armed suspects. The armored vehicle known as the BEAR was acquired through grant funds and is intended to serve the region in the event of a Chemical, Biological, Radioactive, Nuclear, Explosive (CBRNE) event, other major catastrophic events, active shooter events, or events that require a secure vehicle to rescue citizens and public safety personnel and/or to carry personnel to a location where ballistic protection is desired or required. Because the BEAR is a regional asset, it may be deployed in accordance with existing Inter-Governmental agreements. APD also has an MRAP vehicle that was donated by the military. It’s heavily armored on the bottom but not armored on the sides and would not be taken into a shooting situation. It was designed for explosives and it has been used to transport people in severe weather events in the past.

Commander Dudley presented the excessive use of force information to the committee. The statistics provided were for any use of force complaint in the complaint system. It isn’t specifically saying there was excessive force, so the assumption is made the complaint for use of force is excessive. Three years of data was provided, 2018-2020. The methods of system entries could be internal entries or external through the Public Web Report. These are then compiled in the same data base. There were a reported 53 internal complaints against officers with the following racial breakdown; 37 White, 2 Black, 6 Hispanic, 1 American Indian, and 7 for two or more races. Information about the race of the complainant was provided for only two of the complaints. There were 16 reported complaints through the Public Web Report. Of those the racial breakdown of officers is 11 White, 3 Black, 1 Hispanic, and 1 of two or more races. The race of the involved parties was not provided in any of these. There may be a feeling by the complainants that the question to provide their race is biased.

Specific policy violations are identified in the complaint system and there are many that could be used associated with de-escalation issues. The way the system works, each complaint would need to be read to get an idea about the issue in the complaint. One directive was reviewed and analyzed for this presentation which was DM 14.2.21 Police-Community Relations. Data for complaints of that directive were provided for 2015-2020 indicating an increase over time for both, internal and external complaints. Sustained findings and number of involved officers varied throughout the years. Data on complaints received for 2015-2020 regarding chokeholds, strangleholds, or carotid control hold were provided. Data reported was very low until
2020 with hundreds of complaints received for Elijah McClain.

CM Gardner asked for clarification on the training hours provided and if there is a governing body for the standard of training provided. DC Condreay explained the hours provided were just for the basic recruit academy training and that the standards of training are based on the POST Board. They require a minimum number of hours and annual in-service training. APD follows and exceeds their requirements. CM Gardner would like to get the on-going training information as well. DC Condreay will provide that information after the meeting. CM Gardner would like the use of force data to be broken down by tier. DC Condreay explained that data is provided in the Quarterly Report and he can provide that to the committee. CM Gardner added that he would be interested in seeing the additional data, especially related to tier-0. Interim Chief Wilson added that use of force tiering data begins at 2016 so that is as far back as staff can provide information on. CM Gardner asked Interim Chief Wilson to expand on the case-by-case evaluations for returning to work after a critical incident. Interim Chief Wilson explained that information would be able to provide details about the steps for returning to work. With regard to returning to work after a critical incident, APD follows the Internal Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) guidelines. The general guideline is approximately 45 days before someone is considered for return either in a detail capacity or full duty. They go through psychological services and additional training to make sure they are mentally and physically ready to come back. A presentation can be provided by the Employee Support and Wellness Unit at a future meeting. CM Gardner asked if that process was for any or all employees involved in any tier of use of force. Interim Chief Wilson noted that officer involved shootings would be treated at the highest level and others would be considered on case-by-case and could be reviewed for criminality and that there are no directive violations requiring they be removed from their assignment. CM Gardner would like to see a presentation from ESWU if the Chair would approve it.

CM Lawson noted that she is interested in the implicit bias training of only two hours and noted that implicit association testing is available because everyone has bias and identifying that would be helpful. She asked if the scenario-based training situations would include an example of officers identifying three African American men driving a Lexus or other people of color and are pulled over by the officer for suspicious reasons. If bias is identified with a particular officer, are they provided more training. Interim Chief Wilson explained there is required annual training that is video-based implicit bias training provided by Police One. Additionally, she is working with Janice Napper to bring implicit bias training to all city employees. She is also having conversations about providing implicit bias testing for anyone that wants to take them. She would like to make these tests mandatory in the future. Officer Virgil Majors, who is the PD rep on the Community Task Force, brought some ideas about surveys and race discussions that she would like to build upon. She is also working with Dr. Brenda J. Allen to help with what to do once it’s identified. CM Lawson asked Cmdr. Dudley to clarify the data provided of the total number of complaints received in 2018. She is concerned with the accuracy of the data because of his earlier comments regarding having to read each one. Cmdr Dudley noted that was an excellent point adding that there are multiple policies that someone could view as a complaint about de-escalation. His point was that for him to have identified the other categories of policy violations that perhaps met the de-escalation categories he would have had to review each one of them manually and agreed there are possibly more than noted in the data. CM Lawson reiterated that the data provided is very questionable because the review wasn’t done.

CM Johnston asked how the city is meeting the requirements of HB 1119 regarding access to records of completed Internal Affairs investigations conducted by police departments. Cmdr Dudley explained HB 1119 is similar to the IAB Annual Report. Staff is also working to build a webpage for access to complete case information. Interim Chief Wilson added that staff has built a webpage that they hope to get out soon. She hopes to bring it back to the committee before making it live. She added that she agrees that there could be better ways to track complaints and APD could do better by reaching out to other agencies to see what they use. She and Cmdr Dudley will have ongoing conversations about possible solutions.
Nancy Rodgers added that APD does have a fulltime records coordinator that processes requests meeting the requirements for HB 1119 and those are being responded to.

CM Marcano asked when the MRAP was acquired and what was used prior to the BEAR and MRAP. He referred back to the part of the presentation about the MRAP being used in inclement weather and added that he thought this was the responsibility of AFR and would like to know why APD is using the MRAP for this purpose. Interim Chief Wilson explained the MRAP was acquired in 2008 from the 1033 program and the decision was made during the Bomb Cyclone and other weather events to use the MRAP to help get people off the roads and to safety as a teamwork situation. The PD doesn’t want anyone to freeze to death, so they used what was available and worked in coordination with AFR. Chief Gray added that they try to utilize all resources available in those situations. CM Marcano asked if there was an established procedure such as medical equipment stored on the MRAP or if medics ride along with PD. Interim Chief Wilson explained there is not an established procedure but there are emergency blankets available for distribution. The intent is to get people off the highway and to medical for evaluation if needed.

Outcome
Information Only.

Follow-up Action
Council will send additional questions to staff for follow-up at the next meeting.

COURT UPDATES

Summary of Issue and Discussion
Presiding Judge Shawn Day updated the committee about the court and the re-opening of the court. He credited Dr. Zelda DeBoyes, City Attorney Julie Heckman, and Chief Public Defender Doug Wilson for their many hours and meetings to get to the point to re-open the courts. The court re-opened with restricted access on June 1, 2020. They do require masks to be worn while in the building and restricted the number of people in the building to people with appointments or proceedings or docketed matters. Social distancing and temperature checks are required. Citizens do have the option to appear for proceedings virtually. However, virtual court for jury or bench trials, traffic offenses or other hearings where there is a requirement of evidentiary hearings or mandatory appearances such as sentencing hearings, is not available. Domestic violence dockets are still mandatory court appearances for at least the arraignments, but pre-trial conferences can be virtual.

Dr. DeBoyes explained the substantial precautions that have been made throughout the building and presented pictures showing the signage and instructions inside the courthouse. Temperatures are taken at a kiosk upon entry. Anyone registering with a temperature at 100.4 or more is allowed to sit and cool down and try one more time. If they do not meet the temperature their information will be taken, and admittance will not be permitted. The Marshal’s station was fully enclosed to make sure they are safe in dealing with the individuals coming through. If someone is not willing to wear a mask into the building admittance will not be permitted. Automatic hand sanitizer stations are available throughout the building. Plexiglass was used to enclose the witness box so they can remove their mask while testifying. All the courtrooms are marked out to show social distancing. Only two people are allowed to ride on an elevator at one time. There are one-way halls designated in the City Attorney’s area. Dividers were installed in the Public Defender area, so people do not stand next to each other. The traffic area was redesigned with instructions to walk only in certain directions or areas and chairs were removed to provide space for social distancing. Plexiglass was installed around other areas for protection.

Outcome
Information Only.

Follow-up Action
None.

**CHOKEHOLD AND CAROTID HOLD ORDINANCE**

**Summary of Issue and Discussion**
CM Lawson and CM Marcano are bringing forth this ordinance to codify APD Directive 5.8.3. With everything going on in the Nation, most councils and states are implementing similar ordinances into their city code. CM Marcano noted that they had started this draft prior to the directive changes implemented on June 9, 2020 by Interim Chief Wilson. He added they want to make sure this ordinance has the force of law and future leadership is unable to easily change it as they feel these are best practices that are commonly accepted throughout the Nation and this is one of the easiest things they can do to show the community that council is listening to them and council is taking action.

CM Hiltz asked how this ordinance is different from the state law that was just passed. N. Rodgers explained the new state law includes chokeholds and carotid holds, meaning these would overlap. The difference is that the state law makes it unlawful to do these and there are potential consequences and would be excess force. The proposed ordinance mandates a policy that confirms it which then ties to discipline that the Police Chief could impose. They have the same subject matter but different outcomes.

**Outcome**
Approved to move to full council for discussion at the next Study Session.

Follow-up Action
None.

**MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**
None.

**NEXT MEETING AGENDA ITEMS**
The next meeting was confirmed for July 16 at 11am. July items will include follow-up on the use of force and training presentation from this meeting, Fitzsmonns campus response from AFR, duty to intervene, disciplinary process and how the grievance process works, and memberships to lobbying organizations from APD.

The Community Task Force will provide regular written updates to the committee.

August items include Detox and Mental Health from Dr. DeBoyes and Implicit bias training updated from APD.

Meeting adjourned at 12:45pm

APPROVED: ______________________________________
Allison Hiltz, Chair
Public Safety, Courts and Civil Service Policy Committee
Agenda Item Commentary

Item Title: Independent Investigation into the death of Elijah McClain

Item Initiator: Danelle Carrel

Staff Source: City Manager Jim Twombly

Council Goal: 1.0: Assure a safe community for people--2012: 1.0--Assure a safe community for people

ACTIONS(S) PROPOSED (Check all appropriate actions)

☐ Approve Item and Move Forward to Study Session
☐ Approve Item and Move Forward to Regular Meeting
☒ Information Only

HISTORY (Dates reviewed by City council, Policy Committees, Boards and Commissions, or Staff. Summarize pertinent comments. ATTACH MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETINGS, POLICY COMMITTEES AND BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS.)

The Public Safety, Courts, & Civil Service Policy Committee called for an independent, unbiased investigation into the death of Elijah McClain. Since that time, the City Manager and staff have been working with members of the Public Safety Policy Committee about the scope of the investigation, the structure of the investigation, and who shall conduct the investigation. A committee approach is recommended to make up the investigation structure. The committee will be made up a experts in different areas including civil rights law, medical experts, and other areas. In addition to the City's independent investigation, Governor Polis has appointed the Colorado Attorney General Phil Weiser, as a Special Prosecutor to examine the case as well. The independent investigation will be coordinated with the Special Prosecutor to ensure that their is no conflict or interference with the Special Prosecutor's investigation.

ITEM SUMMARY (Brief description of item, discussion, key points, recommendations, etc.)

Allison Hiltz, the Public Safety Policy Committee Chair, and Jim Twombly, City Manager will provide an update on both the draft scope and potential members of the independent investigation committee. A draft resolution to appoint the investigation committee and provide the scope is attached.

QUESTIONS FOR Committee

EXHIBITS ATTACHED:

Resolution on Independent Investigation (DRAFT_6-29-2020).docx
RESOLUTION NO. R 2020-_______

A RESOLUTION BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF AURORA, COLORADO, TO OPEN AN INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION INTO THE DEATH OF ELIJAH MCCLAIN

WHEREAS, the City Council desires to authorize an independent review of the actions of the Aurora Police Department and Aurora Fire Rescue on August 24, 2019, involving Elijah McClain, who died three days later following the incident; and

WHEREAS, Mr. McClain’s death garnered significant local community concern when it happened, with many local citizens expressing anger about the incident and Mr. McClain’s death at City Council meetings between September 2019 and into February 2020; and

WHEREAS, since Mr. McClain’s death, there has been a criminal review of the matter by the 17th Judicial District Attorney’s Office and an administrative review of the incident by both APD and AFR, all of which determined the actions by APD and AFR were lawful and within policy; and

WHEREAS, the City Manager previously hired an outside investigator in February 2020 to conduct an independent review of the incident and whose review was slowed down due to the COVID crisis; and

WHEREAS, as protest, unrest and calls for systematic change in policing increased following the in-custody death of George Floyd as the hands of police, the tragic death of Mr. McClain became international news with thousands of concerned citizens nation-wide and world-wide calling for an independent investigation; and

WHEREAS, City Council expressed concern that the selected outside investigator, who is an attorney with a prior career in law enforcement, did not meet the standard of neutrality that the City and community seeks, and, in response, the City Manager terminated his contract; and

WHEREAS, City Council believes a neutral third-party independent investigation conducted for the City is needed to discern the facts about what transpired that night of August 24, 2019; and

WHEREAS, City Council acknowledges the Governor’s charge to the Colorado Attorney General to conduct a criminal investigation into this matter; and

WHEREAS, City Council acknowledges the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s civil rights investigation into this matter; and

WHEREAS, City Council acknowledges that McClain family attorney has indicated that she is going to open an investigation into this matter; and
WHEREAS, the City’s independent investigation will not interfere with the other investigations being conducted, and the City is committed to cooperation on this important matter; and

WHEREAS, City Council believes time is of the essence and that the City Manager must move forward in an expeditious manner with regard to the independent investigation.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AURORA, COLORADO:

Section 1. The City Council hereby directs the City Manager to engage independent consultants to conduct a comprehensive and thorough investigation into the incident with Elijah McClain that occurred on August 24, 2019, and his subsequent death. This investigation must include a creation of a timeline; a review of all facts from the start to the end of APD’s and AFR’s contact with Mr. McClain; a review of relevant policies, procedures and practices including, without limitation, those related to calls for service, police contact with individuals, use of force, calls for medical assistance, ketamine use, and administrative incident reviews. The role of the City Manager in the investigation shall be limited to the procurement of the consultants and the administration of the contract(s), such as approval of invoices, and the provision of materials needed by the investigation team, such as audio and video records, files, and policies. No City official or employee will have control of the substance of the investigation or final report.

Section 2. The independent investigation team will be made up of at least three consultants who have expertise in independent critical incident investigations, law enforcement and public safety accountability, civil rights, police and EMT training and procedures, use of force, and/or criminal justice. The team will be led by Jonathan Smith of the Washington Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights and Urban Affairs, Washington D.C. In the event a consultant is not able to fulfill their duties, the City Manager may replace the consultant with another person with the requisite qualifications and shall inform City Council of such change.

Section 3. The independent investigation team is to commence its work immediately and shall complete its investigation as expeditiously as possible. Upon completion of its investigation, the investigation team shall submit a written report to City Council and the team, or Mr. Smith as lead, will present the findings of the investigation to the City Council in a public meeting. The report itself will be made public. The report should include recommendations for the City to address the situation that occurred, and recommendations based on best practices that should be employed by the City in the future. The written report should segregate any information required by law to be confidential from the main body of the report.

Section 4. All resolutions or parts of resolutions of the City in conflict herewith are hereby rescinded.
RESOLVED AND PASSED this _____ day of ________________, 2020.

____________________________________
MIKE COFFMAN, Mayor

ATTEST:

________________________
STEPHEN RUGER, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

________________________
Nancy Rodgers, Deputy City Attorney
Public Safety, Courts and Civil Service Policy Committee
Agenda Item Commentary

Item Title: Disciplinary Process including Grievance Process

Item Initiator: Danelle Carrel

Staff Source: Deputy Chief Harry Glidden

Deputy City Manager Signature:

Outside Speaker:

Council Goal: 1.0: Assure a safe community for people--2012: 1.0--Assure a safe community for people

ACTIONS(S) PROPOSED (Check all appropriate actions)

☐ Approve Item and Move Forward to Study Session
☐ Approve Item and Move Forward to Regular Meeting
☒ Information Only

HISTORY (Dates reviewed by City council, Policy Committees, Boards and Commissions, or Staff. Summarize pertinent comments. ATTACH MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETINGS, POLICY COMMITTEES AND BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS.)

ITEM SUMMARY (Brief description of item, discussion, key points, recommendations, etc.)
Public Safety Committee asked for a presentation that discussed the Discipline Process and the Grievance Process. The presentation discusses the process that is used by the police department to discipline its employees. This presentation will cover the process from the time a case is investigated through the appeal process. The last portion of the slide presentation will discuss the Grievance process as is laid out in the CBA and City Charter.

QUESTIONS FOR Committee

EXHIBITS ATTACHED:
Charter and Contract Info re Grievance.pdf
Discipline and Grievance Process PP.pptx
Discipline policy.pdf
Aurora Police Department
Discipline Process

CBA Grievance Process

July 16, 2020 PSCCS Presentation

Deputy Chief Harry Glidden
General Concepts

**Property Interest:** All full time public employees have a recognized Constitutionally protected property interest in their continued employment. This includes police officers, whether or not there is a union or not.

**Due Process:** Because there is a property interest in continued employment, an employee may not be disciplined and lose their jobs without due process.

**What Process is Due:** Generally, the process that is due a public employee is laid out in local ordinances and charters, case law, and – for some public employees – their collective bargaining agreement.

**Due Process for Aurora Police Officers:** The process due for APD officers is set forth in City Charter, applicable court case law, and certain policies.

**Role of the Collective Bargaining Agreement in Discipline:** None. Per the City Charter, discipline is exclusively a management right. Therefore, discipline is not a topic for negotiation and is not a term covered by the CBA.
An officer can be disciplined for a sustained violation of policy. Discipline is imposed by the Chief of Police.

Any misconduct that appears to warrant discipline greater than a Written Reprimand requires an investigation, either at the District level or in Internal Affairs.

An officer is disciplined for:
• Any violation of Department policy
  • Written Reprimand is not discipline subject to appeal

An officer is terminated for:
• A serious violation of Department policy.
• Committing a felony (automatic unpaid administrative leave when charged)
• Violating a POST rule that would result in decertification
Administrative Investigation can be conducted at the District level. These cases are ones where the violation of policy would not result in discipline greater than 40 hours suspension.

In order for a District level investigation to be conducted the District Commander will consult with the Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB) Commander to ensure the comparable discipline is less than 40 hours and the subject officer does not have a history of misconduct that would push the discipline past 40 hours.

The accused officer and the Commander of the district will have a meeting and come to an agreement on discipline. The officer must admit the violation of policy.
Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB) investigations are cases where the Chief has ordered the investigation. These cases typically are more serious violations of policy or implicate a public trust issue, or are complicated and need the expertise of IAB, or the officer does not acknowledge wrongdoing.

Steps
- Complaint comes in (internally, externally)
- IAB investigation – interviews, gathering evidence, creating file
  - Interviews – role of union representative
  - IRP review
- File sent to Chief’s Office
Once the file is received in the Chief’s Office from IA, it is reviewed.

Then, the Deputy Chief convenes the Chief’s Review Board to offer a recommendation to the Chief on finding (sustained, not sustained, unfounded, exonerated) and discipline.

The file is sent to the Chief.
Discipline Process – the Chief’s Role

The Chief of Police will read the case. The Chief can accept the recommendations of the CRB or she can reject the recommendations.

The Chief then meets with the accused officer for a mandated Pre-disciplinary hearing (Loudermill hearing). The accused officer can tell the Chief whatever they want her to know about the case, their reasons for their actions, or anything else they want to tell her.

The officer has three days, per charter, to submit a statement to the Chief, if the officer so chooses. *Potential IRB (see next slide)*

At the final disciplinary meeting, the Chief will issue the discipline order.

Only the Chief of Police can implement discipline within the organization.

If discipline is termination, demotion, or a significant suspension, the Chief must get approval from the Deputy City Manager prior to imposing the discipline.
Between the pre-disciplinary hearing and the final meeting, the Chief or the officer can request a review by the Independent Review Board (IRB).

The IRB is made up of citizens and officers, chosen at random, and the process is managed by HR. They IRB review the hard file and any additional information received by the Chief’s office or officer.

The IRB meets to discuss the case and is only authorized to recommend discipline.

It is the discretion of the Chief as to whether on not she will grant an IRB to the officer. If an IRB is conducted, the IRB will inform the Chief of their recommendations.
Discipline Process - Appeal

After the accused officer receives their final discipline order from the Chief, they can appeal the discipline decision to Civil Service.

Civil Service will hold a hearing regarding the case and the discipline imposed by the Chief.

The Civil Service can uphold the discipline or they can overturn it. Civil Service can modify the discipline.

If the officer, or the Chief, are not satisfied with the decision of the Civil Service Commission, they can appeal to District Court.

If the District Court accepts the case, the will make a determination. That court decision can be appealed to the Colorado Court of Appeals.
The grievance process is used to make complaints about violations of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. It is not related to discipline.

Process

- Complaint received
- Meeting with Chief and grievant/rep within 10 working days after receiving grievance.
  - This is an informational meeting to get more information on the grievance.
- Chief must respond in writing with her decision within 10 working days of the meeting.
- Grievant may appeal within 10 working days of the receipt of the Chief's response.
- City Manager or designee must meet with grievant within 10 working days after receipt of appeal.
- City Manager must respond in writing within 10 working days of meeting.
- Grievant may file notice to arbitrate within 10 working days of the City Manager’s decision.
QUESTIONS?
ARTICLE 14. GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

Section 1: A grievance under the Agreement shall be confined to an alleged violation of any express provision of this Agreement and shall not include any disciplinary matters. Any Police Officer or group of Police Officers may discuss any matter with their supervisor without invoking the formal grievance procedure provided for in this Article.

Section 2: A grievance must be initiated by either an aggrieved Police Officer or by the Aurora Police Association on behalf of any one or more individual Police Officers. The grievant must reduce the grievance to writing and present the written grievance to the office of the Chief of the Police Department within ten (10) working days after the grievant knew or should have known the facts which gave rise to the grievance and, to trigger the Chief’s response time, send the grievance via email to all Deputy and Division Chiefs.

The written grievance should contain:

(a) a written statement of the grievance and the facts upon which it is based;
(b) a written allegation of the specific wrongful act and harm done; and
(c) a written statement of the remedy or adjustment sought.

Section 3: The Chief of the Police Department or his designee shall meet with the grievant and, if the grievant is an individual, representatives of the Aurora Police Association in an effort to resolve the grievance within ten (10) working days after being presented with the written grievance. The Chief of the Police Department or his designee must respond in writing to the grievance within ten (10) working days following the meeting with the grievant and/or representatives of the Aurora Police Association.

Section 4: If the grievance is not resolved to the satisfaction of the Association by the Chief of the Police Department or his designee, the Association may appeal the grievance to the City Manager within ten (10) working days of receipt of the written answer of the Chief of the Police Department or his designee. Within ten (10) working days after receipt of the appeal, the City Manager or his designee shall meet with the grievant and if the grievant is an individual, with representatives of the Aurora Police Association to discuss the grievance. Within ten (10) working days after this meeting, the City Manager or his designee shall give the Association his answer in writing.

Section 5: Within ten (10) working days after the City Manager has issued his written decision, if the Association is dissatisfied with the decision, the Association shall give written notice to the City Manager of its intent to arbitrate. Within ten (10) working days of the written notice of intent to arbitrate, the parties shall attempt to select a neutral arbitrator, to hear and determine the dispute. In the event the parties are unable to agree upon a neutral arbitrator, either party or its
representatives may request a panel of seven (7) arbitrators from the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, and the parties shall choose the arbitrator by counter-striking the names on the list received. The findings of the Arbitrator shall be final and binding on all parties concerned.

Section 6: The Arbitrator shall have the authority to hold hearings and make procedural rules.

Section 7: The findings of the Arbitrator shall be consistent with law and with the terms of this Agreement. The Arbitrator shall have no power to add to, subtract from, disregard, alter, or modify, any of the terms of this Agreement.

Section 8: The cost of any arbitration as well as the Arbitrator's fee shall be borne equally by the parties to the Agreement.

Section 9: Either party may request a Certified Court Reporter to take a stenographic record of the evidence taken at an arbitration hearing. If such stenographic record is taken, a copy of the transcript shall be provided to the Arbitrator. The party requesting a stenographic record shall pay the cost thereof, except that if the other party shall request a copy of any transcript, the parties shall share equally the entire cost of making the stenographic record.

Section 10: The term "working days" as used in this Article shall be inclusive of Mondays through Fridays during which the administrative offices of the City are normally open. The term "working days" shall exclude Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays.

Section 11: The number of days indicated at each level of the grievance procedure shall be considered as a maximum unless said limit is mutually extended.

Section 12: Nothing contained in this Article is intended to interfere with or abridge any constitutional rights of its employees to petition the City.

CITY OF AURORA CHARTER Article XV 15-5

- 15-5. - Employee rights.

All sworn members of the Civil Service of the Police Department except the Chief of Police shall have the right to form, join and participate in the activities of employee organizations of their own choosing for the purpose of representation on the matters of wages, hours, benefits, and other terms or conditions of employment.

Members of the bargaining unit shall also have the right to refuse to join or participate in any activities of employee organizations and shall have the right to represent themselves individually and have individual grievances adjusted without resort to employee organizations; provided, however, that any resolution
reached as a result of such individual representation or grievance must be in accord with the terms of any agreement actually in effect and applicable to such bargaining unit members.

Neither the City, nor any member of the bargaining unit, nor any employee organization, nor any officially recognized employee representatives shall interfere with, intimidate, restrain, coerce, or discriminate against any employee because of the exercise of the foregoing rights.

Nothing in this Article shall prohibit the City and the employee organization from negotiating a collective bargaining agreement which contains a provision requiring all members of the bargaining unit to pay as a condition of employment necessary fees and expenses of collective bargaining and enforcement of any collective bargaining contract which are incurred by the employee organization.
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### 10.2 COMPLAINT AND DISCIPLINE PROCEDURES FOR SWORN MEMBERS

The following procedures apply to all allegations of misconduct except that complaints determined to be related to internal discrimination or harassment will be handled in accordance with Directive 10.9 - Discrimination and Harassment Complaint Procedure.

Pursuant to city charter, the Chief of Police determines discipline within the Police Department. The Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB) is supervised directly by the Chief. Nothing in this order precludes the Chief from monitoring or directly supervising an Internal Affairs investigation, from delegating this responsibility to the Deputy Chief or another senior command officer, or from consulting with the Division Chiefs or Deputy Chief about an investigation or proposed discipline at any stage in the process.

The chief of police should always consider the IRB in cases of serious misconduct or with the potential for substantial community impact in order to determine the appropriate level of discipline.

At any time during the processes addressed in this directive when there is a conversation between a supervisor and member involving a complaint, a supervisor may decide, or the member may request, that the following advisement be read into the record:

1. You are being ordered to answer questions and/or provide a written statement in connection with an internal administrative investigation.

2. Your answers to those questions and/or your written statement must be truthful and complete. You must answer truthfully and completely all questions asked of you. Failure to do so will result in discipline, which could include termination.

3. The scope of the investigation is limited to activities, circumstances, events, conduct, or acts, which pertain to the incident that is the subject of the investigation.
iv. The Aurora Police Department is requiring this information solely and exclusively for internal administrative purposes.

v. No truthful information will be used in any criminal proceeding against you.

vi. If the information you are ordered to provide is used for any purpose other than an internal administrative investigation, you may invoke your constitutional right to silence under the fifth and fourteenth amendments to the United States Constitution and rely specifically upon protections afforded you under the holdings in Garrity v. New Jersey

10.2.1 Definitions

Active Case

A case is considered active when the case is received by any department member. The case remains active until the conclusion of all appeals to the Civil Service Commission on all sustained violations for all members involved in the case or there are no findings of sustained violations for any member.

Initial inquiry

The initial actions taken by any supervisor who receives a complaint or becomes aware of a possible violation of policy, to determine the fundamental elements of such a violation. See further detail in Section 10.2.5 of this directive

Preliminary Administrative investigation

Steps taken by a supervisor to advance the investigation of a complaint beyond an initial inquiry or as the primary process to determine, among other possible factors: the degree of violation, where in the organization to best resolve the complaint and the potential level of resulting corrective action or discipline. See further detail in Section 10.2.6 in this directive.

Finding

The resolution or outcome of an internal investigation based on a complaint and supported facts and circumstances developed within that internal investigation. An investigated complaint will result in one of the following findings:

a. Unfounded—A finding which indicates the act(s), complained of did not occur or did not involve police personnel.
b. Exonerated—A final finding of a complaint of misconduct, which indicates the alleged action did occur but that it was justified, lawful, and/or proper.

c. Not Sustained—A final finding of a complaint of misconduct that indicates an investigation failed to discover substantial evidence to prove or disprove the allegations made in the complaint.

d. Policy Failure—The allegation is true, however, the action of the agency or member were in conformance with existing agency policy which led to an undesirable result; or the member’s or agency’s action violated existing policy even though such actions were reasonable given the totality of circumstances.

Any formal investigation with a disposition code of policy failure will require a memorandum explaining in detail the actual failure. The memo will be sent to the Professional Standards Section for further review.

e. Sustained—A policy violation will be sustained if, after considering all of the supporting and contradicting evidence, violation of the policy has been established by a preponderance of the evidence. The term "preponderance of the evidence" means that the proposition is more probably true than not.

f. Expired—A finding utilized only by the Chief of Police regarding a complaint received three or more years after the alleged event. All criminal complaints will be investigated to the extent possible regardless of the statute of limitations. Nothing precludes the Chief of Police from investigating serious allegations no matter how old they are determined to be.

For compliance reviews such as but not limited to a Force Review Board outcomes, the following recommendations can be forwarded:

a. Compliance—A finding that indicates the member acted in accordance with policy.

b. Noncompliance—finding that indicates the member did not act in accordance with policy.

10.2.2 Scope of Authority for Corrective Actions and Formal Discipline

a. All Supervisors may impose the following performance oriented actions:

- Counseling;
- Training;
- Oral Reprimand;
- Performance Appraisal Entry;
- Corrective Action Report.
  
  b. Sergeants may recommend disciplinary action be imposed, but will not formally participate in the disciplinary process.
  
  c. Command officers may recommend disciplinary action. If a written reprimand is approved by the Chief of Police or designee, a command officer or equivalent rank will deliver the reprimand to the subject member.
  
  When a command officer requests the issuance of a written reprimand, the command officer will complete and submit the written reprimand with an investigative summary through the chain of command to the Chief of Police or designee for approval prior to issuance.
  
  d. The Chief of Police may relieve a member from duty as an administrative action pending further investigation. Additionally, the Chief of Police may impose the following discipline, subject to provisions in City Charter:

  - Written Reprimand;
  - Reimbursement;
  - Suspension (The Chief may, at his or her discretion, authorize that the obligation to fulfill suspension time be met by substituting a commensurate reduction in annual leave time)
  - Demotion in Rank or Grade;
  - Dismissal from the Department.

  The Chief of Police may defer or suspend all or part of any discipline he or she imposes. For comparable discipline purposes, the full discipline, including any deferred or suspended portions will be the discipline used for comparison.

  When officer misconduct results in dismissal from the Department, the following information will be made available, in written communication, to the member:

  - Reason for dismissal;
  - Effective date of the dismissal;
  - Status of accumulated fringe and retirement benefits after the dismissal;
  - Content of the officer's employment record in or with relation to the dismissal.

10.2.3 Advisement

It shall be presumed by members that the following advisement and rules will apply to conversations between a supervisor and employee when the conversation is narrowly focused on the resolution of a complaint.
a. You are being ordered to answer questions and/or provide a written statement in connection with an internal administrative investigation.

b. Your answers to those questions and/or your written statement must be truthful and complete. You must answer truthfully and completely all questions asked of you. Failure to do so will result in discipline, which could include termination.

c. The scope of the investigation is limited to activities, circumstances, events, conduct, or acts, which pertain to the incident that is the subject of the investigation.

d. The Aurora Police Department is requiring this information solely and exclusively for internal administrative purposes.

e. No truthful information will be used in any criminal proceeding against you.

f. If the information you are ordered to provide is used for any purpose other than an internal administrative investigation, you may invoke your constitutional right to silence under the fifth and fourteenth amendments to the United States Constitution and rely specifically upon protections afforded you under the holdings in Garrity v. New Jersey.

10.2.4 Complaint Procedures

The Aurora Police Department utilizes an automated complaint process. This process requires members to access the complaint management system or the internet in order to fill out the appropriate complaint forms.

All information contained in a complaint report is considered confidential. Any member of the department who initiates or otherwise handles a complaint will keep the information confidential.

a. Allegations from outside the department

Citizen/non-member complainants may use the computer version of the complaint form found on the internet, but are not restricted to this format. Complainants may utilize the paper version of the complaint form or any other written format. Complainants desiring to lodge a complaint verbally will be encouraged to complete a written complaint, but not required to do so. Supervisors in the department will accept all complaints in any reporting format the citizen chooses. Complainants may also contact the Internal Affairs Bureau directly.
Supervisors accepting a complaint, either verbally or in writing, will enter the complaint into the complaint management system. Any written documentation of the complaint provided by the citizen to a member will be scanned into an electronic format and attached to the electronic complaint as an exhibit.

Department supervisors will accept any complaint made against any member of the department in a professional manner. Supervisors may attempt to resolve the complaint, but will not attempt to dissuade any person from lodging a complaint against any member of the department. If the complaint is based on a misunderstanding or question of policy or procedure, and the supervisor is able to resolve the complaint, the complaint will still be added to the complaint management system as a citizen’s inquiry and forwarded as any other complaint. The supervisor will note that the complaint was resolved with the complainant in the narrative portion of their entry.

b. The “citizen’s inquiry” is to document that a citizen called, should the complainant later imply that his/her concern was not taken seriously, but carries no points in the Personnel Early Intervention System (PEIS) and is not deemed a complaint. A call from a person, to ask a question is not making a complaint, and need not be documented unless documentation in the complaint system is determined to be appropriate by a supervisor or command officer. Likewise, a complaint based solely upon a dispute over the guilt or innocence of the complainant in the matter of a traffic violation or criminal summons need not be documented unless documentation in the complaint system is determined to be appropriate by a supervisor or command officer. The complainant will be referred to the appropriate court. The member or investigating supervisor may provide information related to the court process but should not discuss the details of the case. This is not a complaint and should not be entered into the complaint system as such.

Responses to surveys or questionnaires will not be treated as complaints.

Any non-supervisory member contacted by a citizen wishing to lodge an allegation against any member will immediately put the citizen in contact with a supervisor. If for any reason a supervisor is not immediately available, the member will obtain the citizen's name and phone number, the nature of the allegation, and forward this information to a supervisor as soon as possible, but prior to the end of shift. The non-supervisory member will also give the citizen the information on how to file a formal complaint utilizing the on-line complaint system found on the internet.

If the complainant does not wish to speak to a supervisor at the time of making the complaint, the member in contact with the citizen will provide the citizen the access information to file a complaint on-line.
Complaints received in the Chief’s Office by mail, fax, email, or other means will be forwarded to the subject member’s immediate supervisor for entry into the complaint management system and the supervisor will treat the complaint as if it was received directly by the supervisor.

Anonymous complaints from outside the Department will be accepted and investigated in the same manner as all other allegations.

c. Allegations by Members (to include all APD employees)

Members who wish to make an allegation against a sworn member are authorized to report directly to the Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB), his/her supervisor, or the supervisor of the member. Members who initiate an allegation against another member may enter their complaint into the on-line complaint system, or the complaint management system listing themselves as the complainant, or if the member chooses not to, the receiving supervisor or IAB Investigator will enter the information into the complaint management system.

The complaining member will not indicate the existence of or divulge the contents of his or her allegation to any other agency, officer, or individual, without proper authorization. The receiving supervisor will not indicate the existence of or divulge the contents of the allegation to any other agency, officer, or individual, without proper authorization. Nothing in this paragraph will interfere with the complaining member’s privileged conversations with his or her attorney, licensed counselor, labor representative, peer support member, chaplain, religious counselor, or reporting his or her information to an appropriate legal authority.

d. Allegations by Supervisors

When a supervisor wishes to make a complaint regarding a subordinate because he or she witnesses or otherwise becomes aware of potential misconduct, and he or she is the first or second line supervisor of the subject member(s) allegedly involved, he or she will initiate an initial inquiry. If not the subject member’s first or second line supervisor, he or she will gather enough information so that an initial inquiry can be started by the member’s supervisor. The supervisor will enter or cause to be entered a complaint covering his or her allegation of wrongdoing into the complaint management system. Allegations made against more than one member, by a first or second line supervisor of one of the subject members, shall be considered initiated by a first or second line supervisor of all of the subject members, and an initial inquiry should commence.

Minor workplace performance issues, not received as a complaint from outside the department or from another member that can be corrected through training, counseling, or the issuance of a Performance Appraisal Entry (PAE) are not considered misconduct needing an initial inquiry and complaint entry.
e. Allegations Contained in Legal Documents

If allegations of misconduct are contained in legal documents, e.g., Notices of Intent, Complaints, etc., and there are no formal complaints against the member(s) involved other than those contained in such documents, no investigation will be conducted, unless ordered by a chief after consultation with the City Attorney’s Office/Police Legal Advisor.

f. Routine and Customary Communication

Nothing in this directive will prohibit supervisors from performing or engaging in routine, normal, and/or customary supervisory and leadership communications for the purposes of counseling, training, and resolving minor discrepancies.

If answers to routine and customary questions somehow indicate to a supervisor or above that an initial inquiry or more formal investigation is appropriate, the processes outlined in, 10.2.5, and subsequent relevant sections, shall be followed. Routine and customary communication will not be used as a pretext to avoid the initial inquiry or investigation conditions in this directive.

g. Delayed Complaints

Complaints received three years or more after the alleged event will be assessed by the Chief of Police or designee to determine the degree of investigative resources to be invested. All criminal complaints will be investigated to the extent possible regardless of the statute of limitations. Nothing precludes the Chief of Police from investigating serious allegations no matter how old they are determined to be.

h. Reporting

On a quarterly basis, the Internal Affairs Bureau Commanding Officer will provide a report to the Chief of Police detailing the status of all complaints entered into the complaint management system.

10.2.5 Initial Inquiry

All complaints will generally start with the named member's immediate supervisor; however, any supervisor may receive and conduct an initial inquiry into a complaint. Additionally, if the supervisor believes the alleged conduct is such that it may result in discipline beyond a 40-hour suspension, or bring the agency into disrepute, the supervisor may forward the complaint directly to IAB for review and determination.
An initial inquiry is designed to gather necessary facts and information concerning the allegation, to determine if any law, ordinance, directive, standard operating procedure, or other city policy may have been violated or a potential for a policy failure exists. The supervisor will ask the alleged subject member(s) questions narrowly focused to the specific complaint to determine clarifying facts, except where the allegation against the subject of the initial inquiry implies potential criminal conduct, in which case Department Directive 10.10: Criminal Investigations Involving Members will be adhered to. The supervisor will advise the subject member that he or she is conducting an administrative investigation prior to asking these questions. These questions, narrow in scope to the complaint, will be focused on establishing the facts of the case to determine: if a violation of policy has occurred, who the violator(s) is/are and the degree of violation.

If, through this process, or on its face, it appears there is a violation which if sustained, would result in discipline greater than a written reprimand, the supervisor will serve a Notice of Investigation and comply with associated protocols as defined in the following sections.

10.2.6 Preliminary Administrative Investigation.

a. Members are reminded that they are required to cooperate in a department investigation and to answer questions by, or render material and relevant statements to, a supervisor or an internal affairs investigator. Members will answer all questions fully and truthfully and will not omit any material facts. The requirement to answer questions as stated in this directive is compelled and is not voluntary. Failure or refusal to fully and truthfully cooperate, may subject the member to discipline up to and including termination.

b. Should the supervisor decide, or the member request, the following advisement shall be read into the record:

i. You are being ordered to answer questions and/or provide a written statement in connection with an internal administrative investigation.

ii. Your answers to those questions and/or your written statement must be truthful and complete. You must answer truthfully and completely all questions asked of you. Failure to do so will result in discipline, which could include termination.

iii. The scope of the investigation is limited to activities, circumstances, events, conduct, or acts, which pertain to the incident that is the subject of the investigation.

iv. The Aurora Police Department is requiring this information solely and exclusively for internal administrative purposes.
v. No truthful information will be used in any criminal proceeding against you.

vi. If the information you are ordered to provide is used for any purpose other than an internal administrative investigation, you may invoke your constitutional right to silence under the fifth and fourteenth amendments to the United States Constitution and rely specifically upon protections afforded you under the holdings in Garrity v. New Jersey.

c. As part of a complete and thorough investigation, the investigating supervisor will make reasonable attempts to contact and discuss the incident with the complainant(s). The investigating supervisor should speak with witnesses, including other involved members to determine the scope and nature of the allegation. Whenever possible, a written statement will be obtained from the complainant and other available witnesses. All written statements will be scanned and attached to the electronic report as an exhibit in the complaint management system. During this inquiry, the investigating supervisor will determine if the allegation is merely a lack of understanding on the part of the complainant, or misconduct by the involved member.

If a procedural or statutory explanation exist, or if the complaint emanates solely from a lack of communication, or miscommunication, the supervisor should attempt to resolve the case with the complainant by explaining appropriate statutory or procedural requirements or by addressing the miscommunication. The complaint can be categorized as resolved in the tracking narrative of the report in the complaint management system and tracked through the chain of command to the commander or equivalent within the respective chain of command for review and conclusion.

The supervisor may also recommend mediation based on the criteria above, described further in Directive 10.12 Mediation.

d. If the initial inquiry reveals a violation committed by a member, which, if sustained, would result in the issuance of a suspension of 40 hours or less, the investigation may be completed by the initiating supervisory officer’s chain of command. To make this determination, the case will be tracked in the complaint management system to the commander or equivalent rank through the chain of command for review.

The commander or equivalent position in that chain of command will determine, based on the investigation, whether the case will be concluded at the district/bureau/section level, or whether it should be forwarded to the Internal Affairs Bureau for further action.

e. If the initial inquiry reveals the possibility of criminal conduct on the part of the member, the investigation will be handled in accordance with Department Directive
10.02 COMPLAINT AND DISCIPLINE PROCEDURES FOR SWORN MEMBERS

10.10: Criminal Investigations Involving Members. The investigating supervisor will contact the duty executive who will determine the appropriate investigative unit/team(s) to be assigned to conduct the criminal investigation. The original complaint, if already added to the complaint management system, will be forwarded to the IAB commanding officer.

f. If the initial inquiry reveals a policy failure exists, the investigating supervisor will note that in the complaint report.

g. The assigned investigating supervisor will complete the initial inquiry in an expeditious manner.

10.2.7 Notice of Investigation

A member will be issued a Notice of Investigation (NOI) if he or she is the subject member of a Preliminary Administrative Investigation where the possible discipline is greater than a written reprimand, or a formal investigation, or:

- the member is required to submit financial disclosure statements;
- the member is required to submit to any test, e.g. breath test, blood test, urine sample, hair follicle test, fitness for duty, etc., as deemed necessary for any internal investigation. Random breath test, blood test, urine sample, or hair follicle test because of a member’s rank or assignment will not constitute the need for an NOI.

The NOI will include a synopsis of the incident under investigation outlining the specific nature of, and the member's status, in the investigation. The allegations of misconduct for which the member will be interviewed will be documented, not necessarily in policy specific language.

Prior to an NOI interview, the member will review the NOI form, sign it and will be provided a copy of the signed and dated form. If during an interview, additional allegations are identified, the supervisor will stop the interview, prepare an additional NOI, and serve it to the subject member.

- Supervisors conducting Preliminary Administrative Investigations will not rely on a "blanket statement" to put the member on notice that other issues of misconduct will be investigated.

Members involved in Critical Incidents may be issued a Notice of Investigation – Critical Incident. This NOI is only issued under the authority of the Internal Affairs Bureau Commanding Officer. Anytime a Critical Incident is suspected to have occurred, the IAB Commanding Officer will be contacted prior to any Preliminary Investigation or issuance of an NOI.

Subject members told of an investigation will not discuss any knowledge they have of the case with any other member or outside source. Nothing in this paragraph will
interfere with the subject member’s privileged conversations with his or her attorney, licensed counselor, labor representative, peer support member, chaplain, or religious counselor.

Any other member who learns of an investigation will not discuss any knowledge he or she has of the case with any other member or outside source other than the IAB, supervisors conducting an investigation related to the case, criminal investigators conducting an investigation related to the case, and/or among the executive staff.

10.2.8 Preliminary Administrative Investigation

Note: An initial inquiry may serve as a preliminary administrative investigation if the information gathered is sufficiently thorough and complete.

Once a supervisor’s initial inquiry indicates that a directive or standard operating procedure may have been violated, the complaint will be tracked through the chain of command to the commander or equivalent rank within the respective chain of command for review. Cases where the discipline would be greater than a forty (40) hour suspension will be tracked to the appropriate division chief with a recommendation to be assigned to the Internal Affairs Bureau.

Cases that involve a minor violation that is most likely a training or unprofessional demeanor issue will be assigned to the subject member’s direct supervisor for resolution. Normally, allegations that involve violations of policy or procedure but have little effect on operations, or, create a small degree of risk and/or liability to the member or the department may be handled with a Corrective Action Report, Performance Appraisal Entry, counseling, or possibly a Written Reprimand.

Cases that require a more thorough investigation and may result in a recommendation for discipline higher than a written reprimand and no more than a forty (40) hour suspension, will normally be assigned to a command officer for investigation. Cases where the subject member is a sergeant, acting sergeant, or above, will be assigned to a command officer for investigation.

Cases where the resulting discipline would range from greater than a written reprimand to a forty (40) hour suspension may be eligible for resolution through the Negotiated Discipline Settlement Agreement as defined in Section 10.2.14 of this directive. It may also be determined by the commander or equivalent rank that the case be concluded at the district/bureau/section level.

The subject member of a preliminary administrative investigation will be issued a NOI under the following circumstances:

a. The member will be interviewed by a supervisor for an allegation of misconduct which the member is the subject of the investigation; and, a supervisor has
advised the member that the investigation may result in formal discipline greater than a written reprimand.

b. The member is required to produce any documentation, including memoranda, related to an allegation of misconduct investigation, which may result in formal discipline greater than a written reprimand.

The NOI will include a synopsis of the incident under investigation outlining the specific nature of, and the member's status in, the investigation. Further, it will outline the allegation of misconduct for which the member will be interviewed and will be documented on APD Form 112.

Prior to a preliminary administrative investigation, the member will review the NOI form, and sign it. They will be provided a copy prior to departure from the interview. If during an interview, additional allegations are identified, the supervisor will stop the interview, prepare an additional NOI addressing the added elements to be investigated and serve it to the subject member who will review it, sign it and receive a copy.

Further, the subject member will be allowed an observer (see 10.2.9 Observer/Representative) pursuant to observer conditions as defined in Form 111.

Preliminary Process

a. The investigating supervisor conducting a preliminary administrative investigation will electronically record all relevant interviews with equipment provided by the department. Subject members who are interviewed during a preliminary administrative investigation may also electronically record or take notes of the interview.

Until the conclusion of the preliminary administrative investigation, the investigating supervisor will retain all tapes, notes, and reports. Except for the notes and recordings of the member or observer, the tapes, notes and reports should be uploaded into the complaint management system as exhibits. Subject members will not be allowed access to the investigative materials until the case has been concluded or set for a negotiated settlement. In the event the case is sent to IAB for a formal investigation, all original tapes, notes, records and reports will be forwarded to IAB, copies of all will be uploaded to the complaint management system. Once the supervisor is sure that IAB has the tapes, notes, digital records and reports, he or she will delete any copies that remain in his or her possession or control. At the conclusion of any discipline, counseling, or retraining subsequent to the preliminary administrative investigation, the subject member’s notes and/or electronic recording of the NOI interview may be returned to the member. The supervisor’s notes and recordings will be uploaded to the complaint management system as exhibits.
b. Supervisors conducting a preliminary administrative investigation into an allegation of misconduct will complete the investigation in an expeditious manner. The investigating supervisor’s immediate command officer may grant extensions as necessary.

c. If, at the conclusion of the preliminary administrative investigation, the investigator believes the allegation cannot be handled at the district/bureau/section level, or believes the final discipline could be greater than a forty (40) hour suspension, the case shall be forwarded or tracked, with an entry requesting that the case be investigated by the IAB, through the chain of command to the subjects’ commander or equivalent rank in the complaint management system. All reports, forms, associated documentation or materials collected during the preliminary administrative investigation will accompany the request for formal investigation.

The commander or equivalent position in the chain-of-command will make the determination on whether an investigation should be concluded by the Internal Affairs Bureau or at the district/bureau/section level.

d. Supervisors conducting preliminary administrative investigations will notify the complaining citizen, government official, or member either verbally or in writing of the status of the complaint. The investigating supervisor will indicate in the administrative management system how the complainant notification was accomplished, i.e. by phone, e-mail, mail.

If the complainant is not satisfied with the resolution of the case, he or she may contact the next command officer in the chain of command. The supervisor will provide contact information to the complainant.

10.2.9 Observers/Representatives

Observers must adhere to the observer conditions as defined in this section and the Acceptance of Observer Conditions form while participating in any and all processes. Observers are allowed in the following disciplinary processes:

- Internal Affairs Interview
- Investigative Review Process (IRP)
- Negotiated Discipline Settlement Agreement (NDSA)
- Accelerated Discipline

- In order to avoid a conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict of interest, observers and representatives cannot be the subject member’s subordinate, supervisor or within the subject member’s chain of command either currently or at the time of the alleged misconduct. In addition, the observer or representative cannot be anyone who has had any role in the
incident or matter under investigation, even as a potential witness or peripheral party.

- If the subject member chooses to have an observer present for the IAB interview, the observer must be present at the scheduled time and place. Should the observer arrive after the scheduled interview time and the interview has begun, the observer will not be permitted to attend the in-progress interview. Prior to the interview, the IAB investigator and the observer will acknowledge the “Acceptance of Observer Conditions” into the formal record.

- Before serving as an observer in a formal investigation, or representative, the member must meet with the IAB commanding officer or his/her designee to be briefed on department policy regarding the responsibilities of the observer and representative roles.

- The observer shall not turn the interview into an adversarial proceeding. The observer may not interfere with the questioning or investigation, will not give any advice that would be contrary to complete honesty and truthfulness, and will not discuss the case with any member of the department or any other person the observer knows or reasonably should know will be interviewed as a witness during the formal investigative process while the case is open (as defined in Department Directives 10.2 and 10.3). The materials present in the room during the course of the interview are not available for review, perusal, or access without the consent of the internal affairs investigator. The observer’s presence is a privilege extended by the Chief of Police, and any violation of these conditions may result in forfeiture of this privilege for the current investigation and for that observer’s presence in future investigations.

Observer/Representative Compensation

a. Observer

If a sworn member is asked to participate as an observer during an accused subject member's interview (including preliminary, formal and IAB interviews), the following procedures will be adhered to:

- If authorized and on-duty, the member will be allowed use of duty time to serve as an observer;

- Should the requested member be off-duty, he/she will receive straight-time compensation for time spent in an observer role.

b. Representative
Representatives participating in the IRP will be allowed up to four (4) straight-time compensation hours to assist with the review of a completed Internal Affairs Bureau case. If more than four hours is reasonably required to perform this task, the representative may request approval of the Deputy Chief for additional time compensation. The Internal Affairs Bureau Commanding Officer will make an entry into the current scheduling system for the representative.

Representatives participating in the IRB process will be allowed straight-time compensation for that time spent in hearing. The Internal Affairs Bureau investigator present at the IRB hearing will enter the appropriate time into the current scheduling system for the representative.

10.2.10 Formal Investigations (IAB)

The Internal Affairs Bureau commanding officer or designee will receive allegations of misconduct as outlined in this directive. The IAB has the authority of the Chief of Police to conduct investigations without interference or obstruction by any member. The Chief, or designee, may assign the investigation to any member or appropriate outside entity should the Chief or designee decide not to have IAB investigate an allegation. Formal investigations will be conducted according to IAB Standard Operating Procedures.

If a complaint concerns misconduct by the Chief of Police, the IAB will forward a copy directly to the City Manager.

Members who are the subject of a formal investigation will be provided a Notice Of Investigation (NOI) prior to being interviewed.

Members who are the subject of a formal investigation are allowed to have an observer present during interviews (refer to the section on Observers). If the subject member has not arranged to have an observer present, the interview will commence.

At the end of the Internal Affairs investigator’s questioning, the investigator will allow the subject member to add information related to the case, to the record, should he or she feel that important information was not obtained in the interview. The investigator will allow the observer to suggest questions to the investigator that are narrow in scope and relevant to the case, that the observer feels were not covered during the interview. The investigator will determine if these questions will be asked of the subject member. At no time will the observer directly question the interviewer or the subject member. The investigator may ask additional questions of the member to complete the interview. The subject member is under the same standards of truthfulness regardless if the statements are made on his or her own volition, or in response to questions posed by the investigator.
If a formal IAB investigation is authorized and includes the charge of 14.1.5 (Conformance to Law) and the matter was also the subject of a criminal investigation, and the criminal investigation has been closed, the entire criminal investigation will be attached as an addendum to the IAB case. Identifying information about witnesses, victims and confidential sources and methods may be redacted from the copy of the criminal investigation that is appended to the IAB case at the direction of the Chief or Deputy Chief and pursuant to applicable records disclosure law.

If a formal IAB investigation does not include the charge of 14.1.5 (Conformance to Law), but, the matter was also the subject of a criminal investigation, the criminal investigation may be attached as an addendum to the IAB case at the request of the member or the IAB Investigator. The member will be informed that a criminal investigation was conducted. Identifying information about witnesses, victims and confidential sources and methods may be redacted from the copy of the criminal investigation at the direction of the Chief or Deputy Chief and pursuant to applicable records disclosure law.

10.2.11 Investigative Review Process

The Investigative Review Process (IRP) occurs at the conclusion of the IAB investigation, and prior to the IAB report being sent to the IAB Commanding Officer for recommendations. At that time, the IAB Investigator will notify the subject member that the case is available for the IRP. The subject member will have fourteen (14) calendar days to review the report and make note of any issues in dispute.

a. The subject member may opt to have an observer appear with him/her or on his/her behalf at the review;

b. If agreed to by both IAB and the subject member, the fourteen-day review period may be reduced or extended;

c. If in the determination of the Chief, there is an important organizational need to expedite the IRP process, validated by the Chief in writing and made part of the file, the Chief may at his/her discretion shorten the IRP process. If the process is shortened, the member will be notified in writing. The member will be afforded duty time, compensatory time and/or overtime to properly review the file;

d. Subject members will not remove the report from the IAB offices at any time during their review. Subject members will not be allowed to copy any portion of the report. Subject members may bring a representative with them to review the report;

e. Subject members and their representative are permitted to take notes during their review of the investigation. These notes will remain in IAB and can be referred to during the IRP.
f. The IAB investigator will also notify the subject member of the date and time of his/her final IRP meeting. The final IRP meeting will be considered a duty assignment under Department Directive 14.2.13 Neglect of Duty. The review of the investigation must be completed prior to the IRP meeting. Disputed issues, including the need for further or clarifying investigation, will be discussed at this time in an attempt to reach an agreement or understanding as to the content of the report. If no agreement on the issues can be reached, the subject member may attach a Letter of Dispute to the file prior to submission to the Chief’s Staff for review. The subject member will have seven (7) calendar days to prepare and submit a signed, Letter of Dispute. A Letter of Dispute is intended to address perceived inadequacies in the internal investigation such as a failure to interview a witness, a failure to inquire into certain areas during a witness interview or a failure to collect evidence. A Letter of Dispute is not an appropriate forum in which to raise defenses to the alleged policy violations or present mitigating information, issues which are more appropriately included in a Letter of Defense;

g. In complex investigations, where the member desires to use his/her IRP notes to prepare a Letter of Dispute, he/she must appeal to the Chief of Police or designee. The Chief or designee will decide if the use of notes is appropriate. If appropriate, the Chief or designee will inform the IAB Investigator. The IAB Investigator in the presence of the member will number and copy the page(s) of notes. The originals will remain in IAB and the copies provided to the member. The IAB Investigator will advise the member of the guidelines for having a copy of the IRP notes using form APD 192. The guidelines are:

- the member will not make copies of the notes in any form;
- the member will not provide information from the investigation or notes to any other member of the Department, except his/her APA or FOP observer listed on the form;
- the member will not provide information from the investigation or the notes to the public;
- the member will not provide information from the investigation or the notes to the media;
- the member will not use the notes to conduct a parallel investigation;
- the member will return the copy of the notes to IAB along with the Letter of Dispute. Upon return of the notes to IAB, the IAB Investigator will verify all pages of the notes were returned;
- members are reminded that Department Directive 10.2.19(h) specifically forbids conducting parallel investigations. Members are reminded that the initial notification of investigation from the IAB Investigator and the Notice of Investigation form, are direct orders not to discuss the case;
- at the discretion of the Chief of Police, an IRP may begin prior to an IA case being completed.
h. Duty time is authorized for a subject member to review the investigation report and to meet with the IAB investigator over disputed issues;

i. If the case proceeds to an Independent Review Board (IRB) hearing, the subject member will be permitted to retrieve his/her notes and remove them from IAB for use in preparation for his/her IRB hearing.

10.2.12 Formal Investigation Dispositions

The IAB Commanding Officer will review each completed IAB case after the IRP process has concluded. The IAB commanding officer will ensure the case is complete and make a recommendation of finding for each alleged violation in the case. The IAB commanding officer can make one of the finding recommendations as defined in the definition section (10.2.1) of this directive for each alleged violation.

10.2.13 Chief’s Review Board

Note: nothing in this section prevents the Chief of Police from exercising his or her prerogative in reversing or modifying a finding or determining levels of discipline.

Further, a member of the city’s Human Resources (HR) department will be part of the Chiefs Review Board (CRB). The HR representative will simply provide input as to the continuity between proposed discipline and that of historic imposed discipline within the city with similar cases. The HR representative will not deliberate in the outcome(s) defined in 10.2.13 (a). The IAB command officer will provide the completed case to the Deputy Chief of Police and will notify the subject member/members’ division chief(s), and bureau/district commanding officer(s) that the case is available for review. The IAB case will not leave the Chief’s Office for the review.

The subject member of the investigation may send a Letter of Defense to be added to the file for the Chief’s Review Board’s use. A Letter of Defense is sent to the Internal Affairs commanding officer prior to a recommendation of findings to provide a defense or mitigation for the member’s misconduct or alleged misconduct contained in the IA file. The Letter of Defense accompanies the case to the CRB for consideration and is ultimately scanned and entered into the electronic file as an exhibit but not included as part of the IAB investigative file. Once the involved chiefs and commanding officers have read the case, the Deputy Chief, on behalf of the Chief of Police, and as part of the deliberative process, will convene a CRB. The CRB will be chaired by the Deputy Chief and consist of:
the subject member’s Division Chief;
- the subject member’s Bureau/District Commanding Officer; and
- the IAB Commanding Officer.

The CRB may see the advice of the police legal advisor during the review process. Should the case involve a conflict of interest with the Deputy Chief or involve a member who reports to the Deputy Chief without a division chief in his or her chain of command, the Deputy Chief will appoint a division chief to be the chair. Should the case involve a conflict of interest with the subject member’s bureau/district commanding officer, the Deputy Chief may appoint another supervisor in the member’s chain of command or may appoint a division chief to take the bureau/district commanding officer’s position in the CRB.

Should the case involve subject members with different chains of command, one CRB will be convened for all involved subject members.

a. The CRB will review the case, discuss the recommendation of finding from the IAB Commander and decide one or more of the following:

- Send the case back to IAB for more investigation;
- Accept, reject, or modify some, all, or none of the recommended findings of the IAB Commander.
- Recommend post-CRB accelerated disciplinary process (see Section 10.2.13 (b) below) based on:
  - A finding of a sustained violation
  - A recommended discipline of no more than a 40-hour suspension

If the CRB determines a finding of sustained for any allegation of misconduct, or noncompliance for any compliance review, the CRB will make a recommendation of discipline to the Chief of Police. The CRB may also recommend additional training, counseling, or other intervention for the involved subject member. The IAB Commander will not participate in the discipline discussion or recommendation, other than to provide comparable discipline examples. The CRB may convene more than once to determine findings and then discipline.

If the CRB determines a finding other than sustained for any allegations of misconduct, the board may still recommend additional training, counseling, or other intervention for the involved subject member(s).

The affected subject member(s) will be informed of the findings and, if applicable, discipline recommendation(s) of the CRB in a letter from the chair of the CRB. A copy of the letter will be forwarded to the IAB for inclusion in the case file.
a. **Post-CRB accelerated disciplinary process**

The purpose of this variation is to:

- Streamline the disposition of appropriate cases formally investigated by IAB
- Allow commanders to have more involvement in cases
- Reduce anxiety for members by not having to meet with the Chief; and
- Provide opportunity for members to have more input in the final outcome of their case

In the event a complaint is addressed through a formal investigation and there is a sustained violation, the case may be re-directed through the post-CRB accelerated disciplinary process for final disposition under the following conditions:

- Member is fully and credibly cooperative
- Member acknowledges mistakes and accepts responsibility
- Chiefs review board sustains the violation; and
- A recommended discipline of no more than a forty (40) hour suspension

Should the post-CRB accelerated disciplinary process be deemed appropriate, it will be inserted into the process flow as follows:

a. The case will be sent to the member’s commander or equivalent rank to begin the post-CRB accelerated disciplinary process. The member and commander or equivalent rank, will attempt to reach a mutually agreeable outcome for discipline. The sustained finding will not be subject to negotiation. If an agreement for discipline is reached, the case is considered settled and it is forwarded to the chief’s office for final approval.

b. If there is no agreement between the parties, the case will be scheduled for pre-and final-disciplinary hearings with the chief. If, after the pre-and final-disciplinary hearings, the member is not in agreement with the chief’s final decision, appeal rights apply.

10.2.14 **Negotiated Disciplinary Settlement Agreement Process**

a. **Purpose:**

The purpose of this portion of the policy is to define the use of a Negotiated Disciplinary Settlement Agreement (NDSA) process in order to provide efficient resolution of Departmental Directives violations requiring limited formal discipline without the necessity of a formal Internal Affairs investigation.
Misconduct allegations do not require extensive investigation when clear and verifiable evidence demonstrates that a violation of Departmental Directives and/or City of Aurora policies and procedures has occurred, and/or the accused member does not contest the allegations. In such cases, an NDSA can provide a more efficient, timely resolution using minimal Departmental resources. It is beneficial to all parties involved to resolve complaints fairly and efficiently in order to maintain public trust in the Department and to provide an improved sense of procedural justice for its employees.

NDSAs are offered at the discretion of the Chief of Police or designee and are not a “right” or “entitlement.” At any point during the process, subject to the final approval by the Chief of Police or designee, the matter may be referred to the IAB for a formal IAB investigation.

b. NDSA eligibility determination:

When an internal or external complaint is entered in the complaint management system, and the initial inquiry has been completed, it will be routed through the chain of command to the commander. Cases where the resulting discipline would range from greater than a written reprimand to a forty (40) hour suspension may be eligible for resolution through the Negotiated Discipline Settlement Agreement. It may also be determined by the commander or equivalent rank that the case be concluded at the district/bureau/section level.

Cases may also be deemed appropriate for resolution through the NDSA by the IAB commander if, after a formal investigation, the proposed discipline range would reflect between a written reprimand and 40-hour suspension.

For purposes of this Directive, “commander” refers to the highest ranking command officer or civilian manager below the rank of division chief in the member's chain of command. Such members shall be eligible and designated to conduct the NDSA process.

The IAB commander or designee will add notes to the AIM tracking indicating that the matter is eligible for the NDSA process. The tracking notes will include a range of discipline based on the comparable discipline for prior similar policy violations resulting in a 40-hour suspension or less. The tracking will be set as due in 5 days to ensure that the process continues in an expedient manner.

c. Eligible and Ineligible Matters:

The NDSA is primarily designed for situations where the facts of what occurred are not in dispute and there is no need for additional investigation, including, but not limited to, the following:
1. The incident is witnessed by other Department members or clearly documented on Body Worn Camera or other surveillance video, which establishes little dispute as to the underlying facts of the incident.

2. The member failed to appear for a duty assignment or court.

3. Unintentional Discharge of a Weapon (either lethal or less-lethal not involving injuries, significant property damage, or other aggravating factors).

4. Police Vehicle Collisions where the Collision Review Process has determined enough points exist for formal discipline consisting of a written reprimand or suspension of 40 hours or less.

5. The subject member self-reports or admits to a Directives violation eligible for the NDSA process.

The NDSA will NOT be used in the following circumstances:

1. When a member is arrested or charged with a violation of municipal, state, or federal law.

2. Where the anticipated or comparable discipline, generally, is greater than a 40-hour suspension.

3. Any allegation of misconduct that is the subject of pending or anticipated civil litigation, unless authorized by the Chief of Police.

4. Any allegation requiring additional investigation, numerous witness interviews, or evidence collection that would be more efficiently and effectively handled by a formal IAB investigation.

5. When additional information is discovered during the NDSA process that would make the incident ineligible for the NDSA process for any reason.

6. When a formal IAB investigation is ordered by the Chief of Police or IAB Commander.

7. Upon request of the Commander or accused member when the member cannot reach a NDSA with his/her Commander.

d. NDSA Process and Presentation Meeting

Upon receipt of the complaint from IAB indicating that the complaint qualifies for a NDSA, the member’s Commander will schedule a Presentation Meeting with the accused member to discuss the complaint and the NDSA process. Ideally, this meeting should be scheduled as soon as practical within 10 working days from the date the
Commander receives the complaint from IAB, however, allowances may be made for previously scheduled leave, training, emergencies, etc.

The member’s Commander will conduct the Presentation Meeting in accordance with existing Department Directive 10.2.6 Preliminary Administrative Investigations and will electronically record the meeting. Most complaints that qualify for the NDSA process should not require additional investigation when assigned to the Commander; however, nothing in this Directive prohibits the Commander from delegating any additional investigative responsibilities required to an appropriate supervisor in his/her chain of command.

At the presentation meeting, the Commander will present the accused member with a Notice of Investigation (APD Form 112) detailing the incident and Directives violation, an Acceptance of Observer Conditions Form (APD 111), as well as the proposed discipline based on the comparable discipline for similar violations.

The Commander will discuss the incident with the accused member and will provide the accused member with access to any supporting evidentiary documentation, body worn camera video, etc. that was used in the investigation.

The Commander should allow the accused member the opportunity to present any facts in mitigation at this time. Based on the information received during the Presentation Meeting, the Commander may elect to adjust the proposed discipline up or down within the guidelines of the NDSA process listed below.

e. Options Following Presentation Meeting

At the conclusion of the Presentation Meeting, the accused member has three options:

1. **Immediate Resolution:** The member may elect to immediately accept the sustained allegation and the Commander’s recommended discipline/outcome. If the member selects Immediate Resolution, the NDSA Resolution Form 233 will be completed by the member and his/her Commander, who will forward it to the Chief of Police for approval and signature. The Chief’s office will return the signed original form to the IAB Commander who will ensure that it is placed in the member’s Internal Affairs file. The matter is considered resolved at this point.

2. **Reflection Period:** The member may elect to have a time period of up to 5 calendar days to consider the findings and the recommended discipline/outcome prior to making a decision. No later than the end of that 5-day period, the member must either select option #1 above or option #3 below. If the member fails to respond, option #3 will be deemed the default option selected.
If the member does not select Immediate Resolution of the issue at the Presentation Meeting and opts for a Reflection Period, the Commander will immediately schedule a Settlement Meeting as soon as practical and as close to the expiration date of the Reflection Period as practical, but no more than 10 calendar days out. Again, allowances may be made for previously scheduled leave, training, emergencies, etc.

The date of the scheduled Settlement Meeting and expiration date of the Reflection Period, if selected, will be documented in this manner as well. If a reflection period is selected, the Commander will track the IAB Commander and the accused member in AIM, with the due date set for 10 days and the Role set as: “FYI only”.

The Settlement Meeting may be rescheduled for emergencies or court attendance that would prevent the member from attending the Settlement Meeting and/or prevent him/her from communicating with his/her Commander on the date of the Settlement Meeting.

3. **Request a Formal Internal Affairs Investigation**: The member may request, in writing, to have the case formally investigated by the IAB subject to the approval of the Chief of Police or designee (IAB Commander).

   The Commander shall document the member’s selection of one of the above options in the tracking notes in AIM. The member shall be tracked at this time and shall electronically sign and close his/her tracking in the AIM entry.

f. **Settlement Meeting**

   Should the member select option #2, the Commander will schedule the Settlement Meeting, which is the final meeting in the NDSA process. The accused member will NOT be allowed a third opportunity to consider the sustained allegations and recommended outcome in the NDSA process.

   During the time prior to the scheduled Settlement Meeting, the member shall consider the settlement proposal and be prepared to discuss the recommended outcome. The member shall be prepared to present any facts in mitigation and make a decision at the Settlement Meeting. The member may also secure the advice or attendance of an APA/FOP observer at the Settlement Meeting; however, the availability of an observer shall not be cause to unreasonably delay any scheduled meeting. The participation of member observers in the NDSA process is governed by this directive in section 10.2.9 concerning observers. The Acceptance of Observer Conditions Form (APD 111) will also be used during the NDSA process if an observer is present and will be uploaded into AIM.
At any point prior to or during the Settlement Meeting, the member may opt for a NDSA if the accused member communicates this to his/her Commander in writing. The NDSA Resolution Form (APD 233) will be completed by the member and the Commander and forwarded to the Chief of Police for approval and signature. The Chief’s office will return the signed original form to the IAB Commander who will ensure that it is placed in the member’s Internal Affairs file. The matter is considered resolved at this point.

At the Settlement Meeting, the accused member may negotiate the recommended discipline, which must be within the range established by IAB based on comparable discipline for similar violations. The member’s APA/FOP Observer may be present at the Settlement Meeting but is only there in an advisory role and may not directly negotiate for the member. The observer is still bound by the conditions of directive section 10.2.9.

The member and the Commander should make every effort to negotiate a settlement. Cooperation and communication by both the member and the member’s Commander is essential for the effectiveness of the NDSA process.

At the conclusion of the Settlement Meeting, the available results are:

1. The member accepts responsibility and the negotiated settlement. The member and his/her Commander sign the NDSA Resolution Form (APD 233) indicating resolution of the matter, or:

2. The accused member does not communicate a selection during or before the designated Settlement Meeting date/time and/or the member fails to appear at the Settlement Meeting, the member will be deemed to have selected to have the matter sent to the IAB for a formal IAB investigation (Option #3 above). The Commander will document this in his/her tracking notes and track the case back to the IAB Commander in the AIM system.

3. The member does not accept responsibility, does not agree to sign the NDSA Resolution Form, and/or does not agree with the discipline recommended. If the accused member is unable or unwilling to accept responsibility for the sustained allegation(s) after the Presentation Meeting, Reflection Period, and Settlement Meeting, and/or refuses to sign the NDSA Resolution Form, and/or does not agree with the discipline proposed by the Commander, then the Commander will track the complaint back to the IAB Commander in AIM.

The IAB Commander, upon approval of the Chief of Police, will then assign the investigation to an IAB investigator for a formal IAB investigation consistent with Department Directives. The member shall be given the opportunity to review the NOI and any audio recordings from the NDSA process prior to any interviews conducted by IAB.
If the accused member has agreed to accept responsibility for his or her behavior but disagrees only with the extent of discipline proposed, every effort should be undertaken to resolve the disagreement during the Settlement Meeting to avoid a formal IAB investigation.

The member’s Commander and/or the accused member may request, at any point in the process, the assistance of the IAB Lieutenant or IAB Commander to assist with the negotiations to resolve the matter. However, if an acceptable resolution cannot be agreed upon, the case shall be returned to the IAB for a formal IAB investigation upon approval of the Chief of Police.

If the matter is resolved at either the Presentation or Settlement Meeting, then that shall constitute a Pre-disciplinary Hearing as defined by directive section 10.2.15. As such, that meeting shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of that Directive and shall be digitally recorded. The member’s Commander is responsible for ensuring that the digital recording of the meeting is uploaded into the AIM system.

g. Extraordinary Circumstances Extension

If the accused member’s Commander determines during the Presentation or Settlement process that extraordinary circumstances exist and that additional time for review or consideration of new information would be in the best interest of the Department or accused member, the member’s Commander may request an extension of up to 10 additional calendar days with the approval of the IAB Commander.

h. Confidentiality:

To assure the integrity of an ongoing investigation prior to closure of the complaint, the member and any department members involved in the NDSA process are required to maintain the confidentiality of the complaint and investigation as required by Department Directive 10.2. and/or 10.3 Failure to maintain confidentiality may result in separate disciplinary action.

i. Additional Information:

Commanders, with the approval of the Chief of Police, are authorized to hold in abeyance all or part of any suspension time imposed. For comparable discipline purposes, the full discipline, including any deferred or suspended portions will be the discipline used for comparison. Nothing in this Directive shall limit or preclude exoneration of the accused member, or the resolution of the matter by alternatives to formal discipline if compelling mitigating facts are presented during the NDSA process which support exoneration or the use of an alternative to formal discipline as being in the best interest of the Aurora Police Department and/or the accused member.
Members who elect to negotiate discipline through the NDSA process will waive their right to an IRB and right to appeal the imposed discipline to the Civil Service Commission. The NDSA Form will notify the member of this stipulation and the member’s signature on the form will serve as his/her acknowledgment that he/she is voluntarily relinquishing his/her right to appeal the discipline. In addition, the member also acknowledges that he/she relinquish his/her right to the Investigative Review Process and Independent Review Board.

j. Post-NDSA formal IAB investigation

Should the Department receive any new information regarding the original matter that, if the information had been known prior to or during the NDSA process would have required the case to be sent to IAB for a formal IAB investigation or would have resulted in discipline greater than the original comparable discipline, a formal IAB investigation may be initiated. Any discipline served as a result of the original NDSA case, if already closed, will be taken into consideration if the member is sustained on any subsequent Internal Affairs investigation that arises from the same complaint or incident.

10.2.15 Predisciplinary Hearing and Imposition of Discipline

In accordance with Aurora City Charter §3-16(8)(b), prior to the imposition of any discipline other than a reprimand, the member shall be provided with a predisciplinary hearing before the Chief or a designee. At this hearing, the member shall be given:

- a copy of the specification of the charges;
- a copy of the written report of the evidence supporting the charges;
- a copy of the summary of the disciplinary record of the member, if any;
- an opportunity to make a statement in response to the charges and written report. The statement, if made, shall be transcribed.
- the right to submit a written statement to the Chief within three (3) days after the predisciplinary hearing.

The member will be informed of the date of the predisciplinary hearing in writing, to include email, by the Chief of Police or designee. The letter will include any recommendations for discipline received by the Chief, or other intervention determined by the CRB. The letter will also include the next steps in the process for the member to include that the member can request an Independent Review Board (IRB) review, in writing, at the predisciplinary hearing or within three days after the predisciplinary hearing. All IRB requests from the member must be made in writing should the member choose to have one.

Additionally, the Chief of Police may call for an IRB review and should always consider requesting an IRB review in cases of serious misconduct or with the potential for substantial community impact in order to determine the appropriate level of
discipline. The Chief, or designee, will inform the member in writing if the Chief has chosen to have an IRB.

At the expiration of the three (3) business day period for the member to submit a written statement and following the conclusion of the IRB, if any, the Chief may proceed in accordance with the provisions of charter. The Chief or designee conducting the hearing may extend the three-day period at his or her discretion.

Per Charter, discipline will be by written command signed by the Chief. If discipline involves a monetary impact on the member greater than one-third (1/3) of the member’s monthly salary, the disciplinary order must be approved by the City Manager or a designated Deputy City Manager. A copy of the written disciplinary order shall be served on the member. In the event this Directive is inconsistent with the language of the Charter regarding discipline, the Charter controls.

10.2.16 Records of Corrective Action Reports and Disciplinary Action Reports

a. Corrective Action Reports: Corrective Action Reports are not disciplinary actions. They will be maintained in the current personnel file software program for one (1) year or until the member's next scheduled evaluation, whichever is longer. Corrective Action Reports will not be forwarded to the IAB, nor forwarded to the member's permanent 201 file.

b. Disciplinary Action Reports: All disciplinary action reports will be forwarded to the IAB following conclusion of the investigation and issuance of the applicable orders. All supervisor documentation concerning Disciplinary Action Reports (including Written Reprimands) will be forwarded to the IAB along with the report. A Written Reprimand, Suspension, Reimbursement, Demotion or Dismissal order will be maintained according to the retention rules of the IAB, and a copy forwarded by IAB to the member's permanent 201 file kept by the City’s Human Resources Department.

Members may request Written Reprimands be removed from their 201 file, and the current personnel file software program after two (2) years from date of issuance. Requests must be submitted in writing to the Chief of Police. Only upon written approval of the Chief of Police or designee, will a Written Reprimand be removed from a member’s 201 file and the current personnel file software program.

10.2.17 Appeal of Disciplinary Action

Fines, Suspensions, Reimbursements, Demotions or Dismissals of sworn members arising from disciplinary action are subject to appeal as stated in Department Directive 10.5 - Rights of Members under Administrative Investigation.

10.2.18 Supervisor Responsibility
a. Supervisory members will initiate an Initial Inquiry when the misconduct observed or alleged is within the scope of their authority.

b. Supervisory members who receive or observe an allegation of misconduct will complete the initial inquiry in an expeditious manner and forward through the chain of command.

c. Supervisory members conducting a preliminary administrative investigation will complete the investigation in an expeditious manner.

d. Supervisory members investigating a complaint will complete the initial inquiry or preliminary investigation as expeditiously as possible. The completed initial inquiry and all supporting documentation will be forwarded through the complaint management system, to the subject member’s/members’ chain of command.

e. Supervisory members discovering potential policy failures because of an investigation will complete a summary memorandum and forward the information to the Professional Standards Section in an expeditious manner.

f. Command personnel who receive a completed Initial Inquiry, or Preliminary Administrative Investigation through the chain of command will review, make recommendation(s), if any, and forward to the next level in the chain of command within five (5) working days.

g. Command officers may impose emergency relief from duty.

10.2.19 Individual Member Responsibility

a. All members of the Department will perform the duties and assume the obligations of their rank in the reporting of complaints or allegations of misconduct.

b. Members are ordered, and required, to cooperate in a department investigation and to answer questions, and/or provide a written statement, render material and relevant statements to, a supervisor or an Internal Affairs Investigator.

c. Members answers to those questions and/or written statement must be truthful and complete and must not omit any material facts. Failure to do so may result in discipline, which could include termination.

d. Any member may be required to submit to a medical or laboratory examination at the agency’s expense when the examination is specifically directed and narrowly related to a particular internal investigation.
e. Any member may be required to be photographed, to participate in a line-up, to submit to a fingerprint comparison and/or to submit a financial disclosure statement when such actions are material to a particular internal investigation.

f. Members may be required to be photographed or fingerprinted for records kept by the Chief of Police and/or the IAB.

g. Members who are the subject of a departmental administrative investigation (including preliminary and formal) are not permitted to conduct a parallel investigation or inquiry into the matter.

h. All members are prohibited from participating in a parallel investigation or inquiry by or on behalf of a member subject to a departmental investigation.

10.2.20 Wearing of Weapons

Involved members and their observer/representative will not be armed during interviews with Internal Affairs Investigators, the IRP process, or during pre-disciplinary/disciplinary hearings with the Chief of Police or designee.

10.2.21 Records Maintenance and Retention

The Internal Affairs Bureau maintains records of all complaints received against the Department and its members. These records are stored electronically, or if not stored electronically, in a secure file cabinet separate from other Department records.

Maintenance and purging of records will be accomplished in accordance with relevant Department Directives, Procedures, City Policy, and the State of Colorado Municipal Records Retention Schedule governing police administrative actions.

Any formal investigation with a disposition code of sustained will require a statement of action taken.

All member and observer notes created in the IRP processes will be destroyed after the case is concluded and no longer active as defined in 10.2.11 above.

All notes and records created in the IRB processes will be destroyed after the IRB is concluded save the final recommendation memo to the Chief of Police, which will remain as part of the case file.

10.2.22 Mandated Disclosure Requirements

Certain notifications regarding sustained disciplinary findings are required by law. In addition to Brady/Rule 16 notifications given to the District Attorney’s office regarding information that could be used to impeach an officer (credibility, truthfulness, bias), there are certain laws that mandate notifications.
a. C.R.S. § 24-31-305(2.5) requires the Department notify the Colorado Department of Law – P.O.S.T. board regarding a sustained finding, based on a clear and convincing standard of the evidence, of any untruthful statements made knowingly by a sworn member after August 2, 2019, in one of these four categories:

1. On a criminal justice record
2. While testifying under oath
3. During an Internal Affairs investigation; or
4. During an administrative/disciplinary process

IAB will be responsible for the preparation, review and submission to P.O.S.T. Notifications are required after all internal disciplinary rights have been exhausted or expired. P.O.S.T. then is obligated by law to start revocation proceedings.

b. C.R.S. § 24-33.5-114 requires the Department notify the District Attorney’s office for the 17th and 18th Judicial Districts whenever there is a sustained finding that any sworn member of the agency has made a knowing misrepresentation:

1. In any testimony or affidavit relating to the arrest or prosecution of a person or to a civil case pertaining to the peace officer or to the peace officer's employment history; or

2. During the course of any internal investigation by a law enforcement agency, which investigation is related to the peace officer's alleged criminal conduct; official misconduct or use of excessive force.

The Chief’s Office will be responsible for the preparation, review and submission to the District Attorneys’ office.
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**Use of Force**

- Can officers use their firearm as an impact weapon?
  - Using a firearm as an impact weapon is not something we train on and is not addressed specifically in policy. If an officer had to use his/her weapon as an impact weapon as a last resort to save their lives, then they would have to justify that.

- Can we get 5 years of Use of Force incidents broken down by tier? Can the race of the officer involved be included as well?
  - Provided in the Annual Use of Force Reports that have been submitted as backup material

- **Tiers**
  - **Tier 0**
    - It may be determined from the data above, but I would like to see further data around officers that point their firearm or handcuff without arrest. This seems to be the tier that is most subjective - in other words, it appears officers have quite a bit of leeway when pulling their firearm or putting an individual in handcuffs. I see that notes are put into the CAD for why either of these happened - does data exist as to reasons or would each incident have to be individually reviewed?
      - Each event would have to be individually reviewed.
      - The following is a breakdown for the 5 years. TZG is gun, TZH is handcuff and TZL is less lethal
        - 2015: TZG – 0; TZH – 0, TZL – 0
        - 2016: TZG – 579; TZH – 481; TZL – 154
        - 2017: TZG – 439; TZH – 387; TZL – 151
        - 2018: TZG – 524; TZH – 429; TZL – 183
        - 2020: TZG – 267; TZH – 265; TZL - 112

    - Why is pointing a firearm at a suspect Tier 0? Seems that this could very easily escalate to Tier 3, and the message sent and impact of drawing and pointing a weapon at someone sends is very different from cuffing and releasing someone.
      - This was the direction when the first significant UOF directive overhaul occurred in 2016, by then Chief Metz as well as the unions (attorneys). Since this is not deemed a UOF, it would require an inordinate amount of time to data enter and would skew results. A firearm being pointed at someone, by the police, in an of itself is not a use of force. Putting someone at gunpoint can be done for a variety of reasons – stolen car occupants, robbery suspects, armed parties, etc. This is a defensive option. The actual application of force from the weapon would be an actual application of force and would be the Tier 3, which requires a significant investigative response.
  - **Tier 1**
    - Does a directive exist to define when a restraint is solely for medical, emotional or mental health purposes?
      - Directive 05.04 covers the use of restraints solely for medical, emotional or health purposes. It is not considered a tier 1 UOF if provided for the medical personnel.
It is not considered a Tier 1 situation re: medical, emotional, mental health – why don’t we report this? Does Fire report when PD issues restraints? Or Falck? How is this tracked? Force is still exerted, even though it’s a different situation.

- They do not

Can you give some examples of tactics officers are trained to use to de-escalate?

- Active listening/empathy – listening; listening to understand the others person’s perspective/ability to understand and share the feelings of another;
- Understanding non-verbal behavior to use and to avoid
- Building a rapport’ a close and harmonious relationship in which the people or groups concerned understand each other’s feelings or ideas and communicate well
- Staying in the car until other units arrive, do not get out and immediately confront, use speaker system to address suspect or event directly, keep car in between officer and suspect
- Calling for cover/letting responding officers know what was occurring
- Using the subjects name
- Ask v telling
- Setting Context
- Giving Options
- Confirm non-compliance with clear communications of likely outcomes
- Officer positioning
- Using objects as cover

With ban on carotid holds, what other control techniques will officers be trained in and authorized to use?

- Without the option of this use of force, officers will be reinforced in the other force options available with guidance in making reasonable use of force decisions based on the circumstance.

What is the penalty for not reporting these?

- DM 05.04 ...” failure to report as required by this directive may subject a member to disciplinary action, up to and including termination.”

How are we supposed to collect accurate data if 7 people can point a firearm but only one is required to report? Granted, 7 in one call could skew the numbers if you’re looking at averages, but there should be a way to track this more accurately.

- We do not have a mechanism to track every officer on a scene who might point a firearm at someone. This would certainly skew the numbers. Each officers report should reflect what actions they took on scene.

**Required Warnings before Shooting**

- How will “verbal warnings that would be clearly inappropriate or ineffective” be carried out in practice? Seems pretty vague and subjective - just wondering how we train for this?

  - This is a new law and we will begin training on this in August. APD officers are already trained to give warnings and have been doing so for decades. The specific issue of when giving a warning would be ineffective or inappropriate would be: An officer immediately comes under fire by a suspect and requiring an officer to give orders, while being fired on would be inappropriate and mandating the officers do so would put them in serious risk of losing their lives.

- Who determines risk or what is appropriate?
• The officer facing the risk is the only person who gets to determine, at that time, what the risk is and what response they believe is appropriate. His/her decisions can and are reviewed.

• What is considered “sufficient time”?  
  ▪ Yet to be determined. This was not defined in the law and will most likely be decided by a court of law

• Will this change include a re-training of the Force Review Board?
  ▪ The new law will require a re-training of the entire department, including the FRB.

**Training**

• Can you provide ongoing officer training hours breakdown (after academy)?
  o APD currently follows both POST and CALEA training mandates. POST requires 24 hours total, 12 hours minimum on the perishable skills such as ACT, driving and firearms. The following is the breakdown of training:
    ▪ Use of force policies annually via ACT practical, 4 hours minimum
    ▪ Weapon proficiency – annually, firearms qualifications
    ▪ TASER – annually
    ▪ Forces stop methods – annually, EVOC
    ▪ Emergency driving techniques – annually, EVOC
    ▪ Less-lethal deployment requirements – annually
    ▪ Weaponless control techniques – annually, ACT
    ▪ Ethics – annually, 1 hour minimum
    ▪ Biased based profiling – annually, 1 hour minimum
    ▪ Legal updates – annually via LMS
    ▪ All hazard plan (NIMS/ICS) – annually via LMS
    ▪ Mental illness refresher – annually via LMS
    ▪ Temporary detention/holding cell training – every 4 years
    ▪ Community policing – annually
    ▪ De-escalation -annually
    ▪ Excited delirium - annually

• Can you expand further on use of force considerations and de-escalation of force?
  o What are some tactics taught?
    ▪ The role of arrest control techniques and tactics in the use of force including, but not limited to 18-1-707 and 18-8-801 through 18-8-803, C.R.S.
    ▪ The difference between general control and physical control. The following state statutory requirements:
      • 18-1-701, C.R.S Use of physical force in making an arrest or in preventing an escape
      • Offenses relating to use of force by peace officers:
        o 18-8-801, CRS definitions
        o 18-8-802 CRS duty to report use of force by peace officers
        o 18-8-803 CRS use of excessive force
        o Federal Civil violations
          ▪ 42 U.S.C. 1983 Civil action for deprivation of rights
      • The implications Constitutional case law will have in the use of force
      • Fourth Amendment rights (Graham v Connor, 490 U.S 386 (1989) U.S. Supreme Court
• Fourteenth Amendment rights (Johnson v Glick, 481 F.2nd 1028 (2d Cir. 1973) United States Court of Appeal, Second Circuit
• Proper documentation for arrests and use of force. Proper documentation in use of force case3s should include, but is not limited to:
  o Officer arrival
  o Officer observations
  o Subject actions
  o Type of arrest control or tools used
  o De-escalation techniques used
  o Were there injuries and was medical attention sought

  o How often is this training conducted?
    ▪ The training is provided annually
• Please provide the training slide (page 6) with how often it is required (annually, biannually, etc.)
  o See above information
• Re: Philosophy:
  o How will this philosophy be communicated to the department?
    ▪ Department philosophy is communicated in all training beginning with the basic POST academy. Direction on law, tactics, techniques and department expectations are included in lecture, power point, instructor led course, directives and LMS videos.
  o What was the philosophy prior to this new one?
    ▪ Department philosophy on training and the use of force remains consistent. Force must be applied according to law and departmental standard; reasonable and justified
  o Will there be new training?
    ▪ The Department is constantly updating training topics and methods across the board. Specifically, for HB-217, the new/changed elements will be included in the 8/2020 in-service session.

**Return to Work**
• Currently, only after a tier 3 incident is an officer put on admin leave. For other tiers, it is a case-by-case basis. Is that determined by the Chief or someone else in chain of command?
  o This is the decision of the Chief and would be made with consultation with the Wellness Unit
• Who is responsible for recommending a review before return to work for a non-tier 3 incident?
  o Chief of Police
• Re: Administrative review – What would trigger a continuation after a second review/beyond the initial 60-day time frame?
  o Information from the Psychologist, doctor, mental health worker that would indicate an officer is not ready to return to work.

**Permitted Tactics on Hand Cuffed Parties**
-Once an individual is hand cuffed, are officers trained to reduce force used & de-escalate?
Yes, this has been consistent in our training for decades. Officers are taught that once control is gained, continuing to use unnecessary force would be excessive. This concept is a staple in the APD’s use of force training.

**Data Requested**

- Use of Force Complaints
  - Can we get 5 years of this data, like we did for other metrics?
    - Provided as backup material
- Duty to Intervene
  - Provide available data on how often this happens and for what tier of force
    - Duty to Intervene is a new law and therefore we don’t have statistical data at this time.
- Please provide the annual analysis of use of force reports/reviews for the last 5 years.
  - Provided. These are included as backup material.

**Duty to Intervene**

- What training will be provided to officers to recognize excessive force on the part of another officer?
  - Ensuring officers have a clear expectation of department approved tactics. Training supervisors to recognize behaviors outside of guidelines. Specific training on how to recognize when to intervene in excessive force instances.
- What actions can an officer take to stop excessive force they witness?
  - Officers are able to use any reasonable and appropriate means to intervene in an occurrence of excessive force.
- What are consequences for failure to intervene?
  - This is a violation of state law and department policy. Arrest and IA investigation will ensue. Failure to intervene is a serious allegation and could result in discipline up to and including termination.
- Now that APD directives call for a duty to intervene, will we track complaints from officers if they witness excessive force?
  - Yes
- What measures are in place for ensuring there is not retaliation? Most of these situations will include a limited number of officers, so whistleblowing will be more difficult, particularly when someone witnesses a superior.
  - Officers already routinely file complaints on fellow officers for improper conduct. Filing a complaint on a fellow officer is not currently an issue for APD and it is not anticipated that it will become one.
- I imagine it is easier to report egregious abuses, but how do you train/prevent your everyday excessive force?
  - There is no such thing as “every day excessive force”. APD addresses the issue of excessive force by:
    - Following the state statute on reporting excessive force
    - Ensuring proper supervision
    - Ensuring officers are using department approved tactics and techniques
    - Proper debriefs of incidents to reinforce positive behaviors and discourage negative
    - Proper and consistent training in the high liability areas that may fall into the area of unintended or perceived excessive force claims.

**Discipline**
• What triggers an IA investigation vs. a sustained complaint? Why does 2019 have 0 IA investigations? (This can be addressed at the July meeting)
  o Reference the “Police Community Relations Complaint” slide presented during the June meeting:
    ▪ Where it is noted “Sustained Findings (# officers)”, in the context of the slide, indicates the subject member’s chain of command made the sustained findings for the (10) ten officers who violated the Police Community Relations policy. The officer’s chain of command addressed measures taken to correct the behavior - which may involve additional training; counseling; written documentation added to personnel file (e.g., Performance Appraisal Entry – Negative, Corrective Action, Written Reprimand); or suspension of less than 40-hours. So while no formal IA investigation had been authorized, the subject member’s chain of command investigated each complaint, made findings and addressed any follow up action(s) needed.
    ▪ **What triggers an IA investigation?** Internal Affairs investigations are authorized by the Chief of Police or designee (Deputy Chief). Generally speaking, serious allegations are referred to IA for determination of formal investigation. (If sustained findings will likely result in more than 40 hours discipline; there are several involved members, making it a complex investigation; significant public outcry; or involves potential criminal activity – then Chief may authorize formal IA investigation.)
    ▪ **Why does 2019 have 0 IA investigations?** None of the complaints for allegations of violating the Police Community Relations policy were deemed appropriate for formal IA investigation.

“**Militarization**”

• Why is the department in possession of automatic weaponry?
  o The only fully automatic weapons in APDs arsenal are the five 1033 M-16s, as reported to in a response to Council last week. These are not deployed and are stored in the SWAT armory. All others 1033 M-16s have been converted to semi-auto.
  o Was this purchased by the department or procured through the 1033 Program?
    ▪ **1033 program**
  o Is automatic weaponry restricted to SWAT or do patrol rifles include automatic weapons?
    ▪ No patrol officer carries a fully automatic weapon. No SWAT officer carries a fully automatic weapon. The five weapons we have are stored in the SWAT armory.

• Why are patrol officers issued rifles?
  o Officers began to carry rifles after the North Hollywood bank robbery in 1997 where two heavily armed robbers wearing homemade body armor robbed a bank and got into a shootout with LAPD. LAPD Officers only had pistols and shotguns and were not able to stop the robbers from shooting police and civilians. 7 officers and 3 civilians were wounded in the shootout.
  o Colorado – Columbine High School shooting event, suspects were armed with semi-automatic rifles
  o STEM School shooting – suspects were armed with semi-automatic rifles
  o Aurora Theater shooting – suspect was armed with semi-automatic rifles.
Numerous criminals have been contacted and arrested by APD carrying AK47s, and AR-15s among other semi-automatic rifles.

Protestors who barricaded APD District 1 Station, protestors had "security" that was heavily armed with long rifles, unknown make or model.

The police would be unable to deal with issues, crimes, active shooter events, etc., if they were only allowed to carry pistols and shotguns.

Has this always been department policy for patrol officers? If not, when was this instituted?
- 1999, shortly after the above-mentioned shootout in LA.

Are these rifles automatic, burst, or semi-automatic?
- Semi-automatic

What are the differentiations between situations where we would deploy SWAT and where a patrol officer might use a patrol rifle?
- SWAT is used for the execution of high-risk search warrants, arrests of known violent and armed suspects, barricaded subjects, and hostage situations. Patrol officers do not deploy rifles on routine calls. They are deployed only on those calls where information is available that someone is armed and threatening to use their firearms toward the police or others. This would include high risk calls such as an armed party, active shooter incidents, etc. Patrol officers are the first to arrive on scene. If the call they are on presents a significant risk to life of officers or civilian, the officers will contain the situation and call for SWAT.

What would the process of divesting from automatic weaponry, the MRAP, and handing off custodianship of the BEAR look like from an operational standpoint? Would this involve auctions, donations to other LEAs, destruction, reselling, etc.?
- 1033 items belong to DOD and are on loan to the department. The department may not sell, give or destroy 1033 items without the express permission of the DOD and their representatives in the State.
- The BEAR is a UASI regional asset purchased via a grant in the mid 2000’s. APD wrote the grant and was designated as the custodian of the BEAR. The maintenance costs, etc., are Auroras. There are other major departments in the region who have their own BEAR and would not want to take Aurora’s. This equipment is also routinely used for a variety of different events, as was explained in a council response in late June.

Are the IGA’s for the BEAR evaluated on a regular basis (if so, how regularly)? How did Aurora become the primary agency for this regional asset?
- I am not aware of an annual evaluation of the IGAs for the grant. Aurora applied for the grant and it was awarded to Aurora.

Animals
- How often are we killing animals?
  - 2015 – 19
  - 2016 – 22
  - 2017 – 13
  - 2018 -11
  - 2019 – 20
  - 2020 - 5

If "destruction of animals will not require the processing of evidence or photographs of the scene", then how does the Watch Commander gather information for additional investigation?
There is no investigation for euthanizing an animal. Officers are required to air information that they are going to euthanize an animal and they may write a report, but it is not required. The typical call would be a deer hit by a car as this is not something animal control would respond to. This is done to end the suffering of the animal.
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Introduction

In conjunction with our core values of integrity, honor and duty, the Aurora Police Department strives for professionalism in the performance of our duties. We encourage positive behavior in our employees by the use of awards and commendations. We also encourage our employees and citizens to report any perceived misconduct by our officers. We investigate every complaint and concern reported to the Department and take appropriate action, protecting the rights of the citizen and the Department member. This report reflects our commitment to openness and transparency to the people we serve.

The Department has two systems to award outstanding performance and three systems to manage complaints and discipline. The two award systems are Formal Department Awards and Informal Commanders’ Commendations. The three systems used to manage complaints and disciplines are: the Automated Complaint and Commendation System; District / Bureau Discipline; and Formal Internal Investigations and Discipline.

Formal Department Awards

All employees of the Department who become aware of outstanding performance are encouraged to nominate employees and citizens for recognition through the Formal Department Awards program. The Awards Board reviews and investigates all nominations for formal awards and then makes a recommendation to the Chief of Police. The Chief of Police makes the final decision on the appropriateness of each award. Awards available under the Formal Department Awards program are: Medal of Honor; Distinguished Service Cross; Purple Heart; Life Saving Award; Meritorious Service Ribbon; Chief’s Commendation Certificate; Chief’s Unit Citation; Community Commitment Certificate; and the Certificate of Appreciation – Citizen’s Award. These awards are described in the Formal Department Awards section of this report.

Informal Commander’s Commendations

Any Command Level Officer may, without a nomination to the Awards Board, award a Commander’s Commendation Certificate. The Informal Commander’s Commendations section of this report describes the certificate.

Automated Complaint and Commendation System

The Aurora Police Department created the Automated Complaint and Commendation System in 2006 to manage the investigations of and record all complaints and commendations received on sworn officers of the Department. Regardless of how received, all complaints and commendations are entered into the automated system.

Citizens can enter their complaint or commendation directly online through the City’s website. If the Department receives a complaint or commendation in person, on the telephone or in writing, the receiving employee enters the information into the system. Once entered in the automated system, the complaint or commendation remains open until closed by the officer’s Division Chief.
The system directs the complaint or commendation to the officer’s immediate supervisor for an investigation. The supervisor reports his/her finding to his/her supervisor, who approves or disapproves the investigation. That process continues until the officer’s Division Chief ultimately reviews all decisions in the chain of command and approves the investigation and resulting actions.

Safeguards built into the system include the following: no one can delete the complaint or commendation. Only one supervisor can work on the complaint at a time (following the chain of command). Supervisors can add information but cannot remove it. All information inserted into the system is saved, documenting the date and time submitted and by whom. Supervisors can search the system to determine if the officer has like complaints and or commendations.

The system records all of the information and produces statistical information. Police managers use the information to determine future training needs as well as to decide an appropriate level of discipline

**District and Bureau Discipline**

The most severe result of incidents reported in this section are Written Reprimands, which are the lowest level of formal discipline. The Internal Affairs Section investigates cases that may require discipline greater than a Written Reprimand. Cases that result in corrective measures (training verses discipline) are recorded in the Automated Complaint and Commendation System. A Police Department Supervisor or Manager investigates all District / Bureau Discipline cases. He/she obtains all of the necessary information and reports his/her findings to his/her supervisor. The employee’s chain of command reviews the investigation. If any supervisor in the chain of command determines that the employee violated a Department Directive(s) and decides the appropriate level of discipline is a Written Reprimand, he/she makes that recommendation to the Chief of Police. If the Chief concurs with the findings, a Written Reprimand is prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Chief. The Chief of Police may personally issue and serve the Written Reprimand on the employee or delegate this duty to a command officer within the employee’s chain of command. The Written Reprimand is part of the employee’s permanent discipline file.

**Formal Internal Investigations and Discipline**

The Chief of Police orders all formal internal investigations. As a general rule, the Chief orders formal investigations on allegations that could potentially result in discipline that is greater than a Written Reprimand. Additionally, critical incidents (i.e. police shootings, use of force resulting in serious injuries or death, serious traffic accidents involving officers, etc.) may result in the Chief ordering a formal investigation regardless of whether there is any evidence or accusation of misconduct. The Chief’s order will allege a violation(s) of Department Directive(s). The Internal Affairs Section completes the investigation and reports its findings to the accused officer’s Division Chief. The officer’s Division Chief decides whether the evidence proves the alleged violation(s). If so, the Division Chief will sustain the allegation(s). When the Division Chief sustains an allegation, the Chief of Police orders discipline in accordance with the City’s and Department’s policies.
Perspective Statistics
The Department provides the following statistical information for the purpose of perspective. The Department currently employs 667 sworn officers and 137 civilian employees (total 804). During 2014, the Department handled 215,029 calls for service from the public, arrested 11,655 suspects, issued 6,763 criminal summonses (non-custodial arrests) and issued 53,708 traffic citations.

Formal Department Awards
During 2014, the Aurora Police Department presented 147 awards through the formal program. The Department did not present a Medal of Honor award. The Department honored six (6) officers with the Distinguished Service Cross. The Department presented one (1) Purple Heart Award. The Department presented ten (10) officers with the Life Saving Award. The Department recognized eleven (11) officers with the Meritorious Service Ribbon. The Chief commended one hundred-eight (108) officers with Chief’s Commendation Certificates. The Chief presented nine (9) Chief’s Unit Citations. The Department presented two (2) citizens with the Certificate of Appreciation - Citizens Award.


**Medal of Honor**

The Medal of Honor may be awarded by the Chief of Police to members who distinguish themselves by intentionally and knowingly placing themselves in a situation that involves an actual and imminent danger of death and whose actions demonstrate conspicuous bravery or heroism significantly above and beyond the call of duty. The member must perform an act so outstanding that it clearly demonstrates extraordinary courage beyond the requirements of the Distinguished Service Cross. The member must have been aware of the great personal danger to himself/herself prior to the performance of the act and the act must have involved an imminent, actual and substantial threat to the member’s life. This award will be a medal, pin and a certificate presented by the Chief of Police.

The department did not present a **Medal of Honor** award in 2014.
Distinguished Service Cross

The Distinguished Service Cross may be awarded by the Chief of Police to members who distinguish themselves by demonstrating exceptional bravery despite an imminent risk of serious bodily injury or death. A member may be aware or unaware of great personal peril to himself/herself prior to the performance of the act. This award will be a medal, pin and a certificate presented by the Chief of Police.

The department presented six (6) Distinguished Service Cross awards in 2014.

Sergeant Mike Holm, Officer Jeffrey Jacobs, Officer Tim King, and Officer Jason Petrucelli

On January 5, 2013, at 0400hrs, APD SWAT responded to the 16000 block of East Ithaca Place on a report of a barricaded suspect that may have shot and killed three people inside. Telephone contact was established with the suspect by the Crisis Negotiation Team, in which the suspect was determined to be delusional and uncooperative. A standoff ensued for approximately six hours under frigid temperatures. The suspect continued to be aggressive and combative, threatening to fire at officers if they attempted to come inside. A decision was made to attempt a breach of the front windows of the townhome for insertion of a robot and expose a view of the living room area. This exposure would impair the suspect’s movements throughout the townhome and isolate him to a particular area. SWAT Sergeant, Mike Holm, and other SWAT officers used a “Bearcat” armored vehicle to accomplish this plan. During the breach, Sgt. Holm left the security of the armored vehicle briefly and used a breaching pole to clear the large window on the ground floor, totally exposing himself to the suspect. Upon re-entering the Bearcat, the suspect fired on Sgt. Holm and the other officers, striking the Bearcat with a barrage of .223 rounds. The task was accomplished and it did in fact force the suspect to isolate himself to the second floor area. Negotiations continued to fail so an order was given to go into an “offensive posture”, meaning to engage the suspect upon visual contact. Chemical agents were introduced into the home to gain the suspect’s compliance. A short time later the chemical agents worked and the suspect exposed himself to a SWAT officer on the second floor who used deadly force to neutralize the suspect and bring closure to this horrific incident.

For demonstrating exceptional bravery despite facing imminent risk of serious bodily injury or death, these officers are commended for their actions and are hereby awarded the Aurora Police Department’s Distinguished Service Cross.
Agent Craig Hopkins
In June 2013, Aurora Police Department Agent Craig Hopkins, and other members of the East Metro Auto Theft Team (EMATT) became aware of a criminal suspect engaged in a metro-wide crime spree. The suspect in this investigation had previously attempted to “run-over” another Aurora Police Department Officer with a vehicle, attempted to kill a City of Aurora resident with a handgun, been involved in numerous motor vehicle thefts and burglaries and made previous statements to his family members that he would, “Shoot it out with the police before going back to prison.” On the morning of July 10, 2013, members of the Aurora Police Department Fugitive Apprehension and Surveillance Team (FAST) located the suspect in a residential area and called in members of SWAT for support. Upon seeing members of SWAT move in on his location, the suspect attempted to flee the area in a stolen vehicle, which he had used in a shooting incident the previous week. The suspect began driving this stolen vehicle in reverse at a high rate of speed in the direction of officers and civilians in the area. Agent Hopkins, recognizing the imminent danger the suspect posed to officers and citizens, took the decisive action of driving his patrol unit into the suspect’s stolen vehicle resulting in a major collision that disabled both vehicles. The suspect then attempted to flee the area on foot, but was apprehended by officers after a foot chase. Agent Hopkins sustained a major injury which required surgery and rehabilitation.

The heroic, courageous, and selfless actions of Agent Craig Hopkins on this day protected the citizens of the City of Aurora, his fellow law enforcement officers and enabled the arrest of a very dangerous criminal. Agent Craig Hopkins is hereby awarded this Distinguished Service Cross.

Officer Specialist David Wilson
On May 4, 2013, Officer Specialist David Wilson was performing patrol duties when a citizen frantically notified him that the US Bank at 2990 S. Peoria St. was being robbed. Officer Wilson immediately proceeded to the bank and observed a vehicle exiting the bank parking lot at a high rate of speed. Officer Wilson determined that the speeding vehicle was in fact the robbery suspect and gave chase. After a short vehicle pursuit, the suspect vehicle made a quick turn onto a residential neighborhood street that was a dead-end and crashed on a large landscape boulder. Officer Wilson gave numerous orders for the suspect to exit the vehicle and to get on the ground. The suspect did exit the vehicle but ignored all other orders. The suspect retrieved a bag from the driver seat of his vehicle and reached into it for an unknown object. Believing the suspect was going for a weapon, and fearing for his life, Officer Wilson fired his duty weapon striking the suspect with three rounds. After being seriously wounded by gunfire, the suspect ran from Officer Wilson through the residential neighborhood. Officer Wilson gave chase on foot and used his Taser to incapacitate and apprehend the suspect.

Officer Specialist David Wilson demonstrated exceptional bravery despite an imminent risk of serious bodily injury or death. He is highly commended for his devotion to duty and is hereby awarded the Distinguished Service Cross.
Purple Heart

The Purple Heart may be awarded by the Chief of Police to any member who sustains a gunshot wound, stab wound, or serious injury, under aggravated and hostile circumstances, which could have resulted in death or could potentially result in a permanent disability, which may force the member to retire. This award will be a medal, pin, and a certificate presented by the Chief of Police.

The department presented one (1) Purple Heart award in 2014.

Agent Craig Hopkins

In June 2013, Aurora Police Department Agent Craig Hopkins, and other members of the East Metro Auto Theft Team became aware of a criminal suspect engaged in a metro-wide crime spree. The suspect in this investigation had previously attempted to “run-over” another Aurora Police Department Officer with a vehicle, attempted to kill a City of Aurora resident with a handgun, been involved in numerous motor vehicle thefts and burglaries and made previous statements to his family members that he would, “Shoot it out with the police before going back to prison.” On the morning of July 10, 2013, members of the Aurora Police Department Fugitive Apprehension and Surveillance Team (FAST) located the suspect in a residential area and called in members of SWAT for support. Upon seeing members of SWAT move in on his location, the suspect attempted to flee the area in a stolen vehicle in which he had used in a shooting incident the previous week. The suspect began driving this stolen vehicle in reverse at a high rate of speed in the direction of officers and civilians who happened to be in the area. Agent Hopkins, recognizing the imminent danger that the suspect posed to officers and citizens, took the decisive action of driving his patrol unit into the suspect’s stolen vehicle which resulted in a major collision that disabled both vehicles. The suspect then attempted to flee the area on foot, but was apprehended by officers after a foot chase. Agent Hopkins sustained a major injury which required surgery and rehabilitation.

The heroic, courageous and selfless actions of Agent Craig Hopkins on this day protected the citizens of the City of Aurora, his fellow law enforcement officers and enabled the arrest of a very dangerous criminal. For injuries suffered as a result of this incident, Agent Craig Hopkins is hereby awarded the Purple Heart.
Life Saving Award

The Life Saving Award may be awarded by the Chief of Police to members who personally save a life. The lifesaving effort will normally involve one of the learned life supporting processes: mouth-to-mouth resuscitation, cardio-pulmonary resuscitation, the Heimlich maneuver for choking victims, or the control of severe bleeding. Actions meriting this award will be significant actions by the member. The award will only be bestowed if the victim survives the incident. The request for a life-saving award will be accompanied by a document from witnesses or an attending physician stating the methods applied contributed significantly to the victim’s survival. This award will only apply when victims are at imminent risk of death. This will normally not include deliberate actions taken by the victims, unless the victims have inflicted injury upon themselves that is actually life threatening. This award will be a pin and certificate presented by the Chief of Police.

The department presented ten (10) Life Saving Awards in 2014.

Officer Steven Ficco, Officer Steven Garcia, Officer Juan Gonzalez, Officer Jeremy J. Jenkins, and Officer Edward Vance

On November 11, 2013, Officer Steven Garcia was responding to a robbery alarm when he observed a stationwagon make a lane change and strike a motorized scooter. The motorized scooter and its male rider were completely runover by the stationwagon and dragged underneath for about two-hundred feet before coming to a stop. Officer Garcia quickly aired the accident and Officers Juan Gonzalez, Jeremy Jenkins, Steven Ficco and Edward Vance rapidly responded to the scene to assist. Working as a team, Garcia, Jenkins and Vance lifted the stationwagon up off the ground while Ficco and Gonzalez pulled the driver of the scooter from underneath the vehicle. This was a very difficult task as the victim had been wearing a backpack which had gotten entangled in the undercarriage of the station-wagon. Additionally, the two occupants of the stationwagon were still seated inside the vehicle, making it more difficult for the officers to keep the car suspended while the rescue actions proceeded. Once the victim was freed, officers performed first aid and maintained the subject’s airway until AFD Rescue personnel arrived on-scene. The injured party was transported to the hospital and treated for life threatening injuries to the head, neck, leg and pelvis.

Due to the swift and decisive actions by these officers, the victim of this horrific accident survived. Their courageous actions exemplify the very best qualities of Law Enforcement. Aurora Police Department Officers Steven Garcia, Juan Gonzalez, Jeremy Jenkins, Steven Ficco and Edward Vance are hereby awarded the Life Saving Award.

Officer Fermin Moreno and Officer Carlos Wilkendorf

On November 7, 2013, Aurora Police Officers responded to 1926 Galena Street on report of an attempted suicide. Officer Fermin Moreno responded to the scene and located a hysterical mother in the garage of
the residence, attempting to perform CPR on her 18-year-old daughter. The young woman was unconscious, bleeding from her arms, surrounded by broken glass and had fresh lacerations around her neck from attempting to hang herself. Officer Fermin quickly verified that the young woman was not breathing and had no pulse. Officer Moreno immediately began chest compressions while Officer Carlos Wilkendorf responded with a breath mask and began providing the young woman with rescue breaths. Officers Moreno and Wilkendorf continued these life-saving efforts, enabling her heart to beat and restore her breathing. City of Aurora Fire and Rescue personnel responded and transported the young woman to the hospital where she made a full medical recovery. The officers completed an extensive and thorough investigation into the matter. On November 12, 2013, Aurora Fire Lieutenant John Lauder later reported to former Aurora Police Chief Daniel Oates, “I am proud to work amongst police officers of such high caliber.”

The Life Saving efforts of Officers Moreno and Wilkendorf set a tremendous example of commitment to community, excellence in law enforcement and provided a young woman with another opportunity at life. Officers Fermin Moreno and Carlos Wilkendorf are hereby awarded the Aurora Police Department Life Saving Award.

Officer Michael J. Moore
On September 12, 2013, Aurora Police Officer Michael Moore was working in an off duty capacity at 10190 E. Colfax Ave, US Bank, when he witnessed a vehicle being pushed sideways by a heavy current of flood waters, which were a result of a torrential down-pour of rain. Officer Moore noticed that the vehicle was occupied by two elderly people who were helpless to evacuate themselves from the situation. Officer Moore attempted to rescue the elderly couple but the fast moving current of flood water was too strong to maneuver through alone. Aurora Citizen Jose Cebollos observed Officer Moore’s efforts and immediately proceeded to his location to assist. Officer Moore and Jose Cebollos moved through the flooded roadway, working together as a team, to open the doors of the flooded vehicle. With great effort, they extracted the elderly couple one at a time, making two trips through the flooded roadway, and moving the couple to a safe area where they received medical attention. The elderly couple was later released from the scene without any significant injuries related to the incident. Due to the courageous and cooperative teamwork of Officer Moore and Jose Cebollos, the victims were able to escape this dangerous, life threatening situation without harm. Officer Michael Moore is hereby awarded the Aurora Police Department Life Saving Award. Officer Moore was also recognized with a Commander’s Commendation for his actions.

Officer Randall Carroll
On April 13, 2013, at 0141 hours, APD officers responded to a call of a shooting at Primo’s Bar at 1443 Chester Street. Officers Carroll and Burke were the first to arrive on scene and found two victims (Bryant and Adams) suffering from multiple gunshot wounds. There was an unruly bar crowd, 30 to 40 people, surrounding the victims; some were actively fighting each other. Both Officers made their way to the victims and began life saving efforts as best they could. Other officers arrived on scene and forced their way into the crowd to create a 10-foot perimeter around Carroll, Burke and the victims. Officer Carroll noticed a large amount of blood coming from a gunshot wound of Adams’ leg. Carroll quickly obtained a
t-shirt and belt from a by-stander and applied a make shift tourniquet to stem the loss of blood. Patrol Sergeants Jonsgaard and Hildebrand arrived on scene and immediately requested more patrol units to respond with riot control gear. Responding officers were able to push the aggressive crowd back so these life-saving efforts could be completed and the victims evacuated for medical treatment. Sadly, Bryant did not survive the ordeal. However, ER Dr. Michael Jobin advised later, “The use of the tourniquet by the officer was instrumental in countering the loss of blood from Mr. Adams and did aid greatly in keeping him alive following the shooting.”

If not for the courage of these officers, this hostile situation could have been much worse, and another life lost. Due to Officer Randall Carroll’s life-saving efforts and performing a difficult task under unusual hostile circumstances, he is hereby awarded the Life Saving Award.

Officer Jimmy W. Bath
On May 16, 2013, Officer Jimmy Bath responded to a report of an injury accident in the area of S. Havana St. and E. Mexico Ave. Upon arrival, Officer Bath quickly located an unconscious male inside of a wrecked vehicle involved in the accident. The unconscious party’s wife informed Officer Bath that she believed her husband had sustained a heart attack during the vehicle accident. Officer Bath quickly assessed the unconscious male and determined that he was not breathing and had no pulse. Officer Bath took it upon himself to immediately begin CPR on the unconscious male who was still inside his wrecked vehicle. Officer Bath tirelessly continued this effort until Aurora Fire and Rescue personnel arrived. The unconscious party was transported by ambulance to the hospital where he was successfully treated and eventually released from medical care.

The quick and decisive actions of Officer Bath in this incident were instrumental in saving the life of a citizen in dire and life-threatening circumstances. Officer Bath performed his job in such a manner as to reflect great credit upon himself, the Aurora Police Department and the City of Aurora. Officer Jimmy Bath is hereby awarded the Aurora Police Department Life Saving Award.
Meritorious Service Ribbon

The Meritorious Service Ribbon may be awarded by the Chief of Police for service rendered in the line of duty when a member, because of diligence and perseverance, performs difficult tasks under unusual circumstances and goes far beyond that which is normally expected of members. This award will be a pin and certificate presented by the Chief of Police.

The department presented eleven (11) Meritorious Services Ribbons in 2014.

Officer Ryan Burke, Officer Randall Carroll, Sergeant Specialist Mark Hildebrand, Sergeant Specialist Gerald Jonsgaard, Officer Cynthia Lengyel, Officer John Moreland, and Officer Benjamin Petering

On April 13, 2013, at 0141 hours, APD officers responded to a call of a shooting at Primo’s Bar at 1443 Chester Street. Officers Carroll and Burke were the first to arrive on scene and found two victims (Bryant and Adams) suffering from multiple gunshot wounds. There was an unruly bar crowd, 30 to 40 people, surrounding the victims; some were actively fighting each other. Both Officers made their way to the victims and began life saving efforts as best they could. Other officers arrived on scene and forced their way into the crowd to create a 10-foot perimeter around Carroll, Burke and the victims. Officer Carroll noticed a large amount of blood coming from a gunshot wound of Adams’ leg. Carroll quickly obtained a t-shirt and belt from a by-stander and applied a make shift tourniquet to stem the loss of blood. Patrol Sergeants Jonsgaard and Hildebrand arrived on scene and immediately requested more patrol units to respond with riot control gear. Responding officers were able to push the aggressive crowd back so these life-saving efforts could be completed and the victims evacuated for medical treatment. Sadly, Bryant did not survive the ordeal. However, ER Dr. Michael Jobin advised later, “The use of the tourniquet by the officer was instrumental in countering the loss of blood from Mr. Adams and did aid greatly in keeping him alive following the shooting.”

If not for the courage of these officers, this hostile situation could have been much worse, and another life lost. The diligence, perseverance, and dedication to duty on this date by these officers brought great credit upon themselves, the Aurora Police Department, and the Law Enforcement Profession.

Officer Steve Garcia, Officer Jonathan McCants, Officer Benjamin Petering, and Officer William Stricklin
On December 15, 2013, at 0454hrs, APD officers responded to a man with a gun report in front of 1742 Jamaica Street. The RP related the man with the gun was her boyfriend, Stephen Adams, and he was armed with a shotgun, which he had fired in front of the residence two days prior. The RP related Adams had left the scene and gave a vehicle description. Officer Jeffrey Olson found the suspect vehicle and followed it, going in various directions until the suspect drove back to the Jamaica address and parked in front of it. Officers arriving on scene immediately attempted a felony stop and gave orders for Adams to exit the vehicle. Adams, for the next 45 minutes, challenged the officers to shoot him, got in and out of the vehicle, started it and attempted to back up and then go forward. At 0530 hours, Adams produced a
12-gauge shot gun and pointed it out of the driver’s window at the officers positioned to the left and rear. Officers did not fire at this point and Adams placed the shotgun into his own face and demanded to talk with his girlfriend. Adams again pointed the shotgun at officers out the open window and officers fired, striking Adams several times. Adams was taken into custody without incident and treated for his wounds.

Due to the calm and professional actions of all officers and supervisors involved with this call, a dangerous suspect was taken into custody. For performing a difficult task under unusual circumstances and going far beyond that which is normally expected of members.
Chief's Commendation Certificate

The Chief’s Commendation Certificate may be awarded by the Chief of Police to a member for exceptional contribution to the progress of the Department, or to individuals who perform their duties in an unusually effective manner. The contribution must be adopted by the Department and increase the administrative or operational efficiency of the Department. The Chief of Police may recognize individual members of other law enforcement organizations, or multi-jurisdictional task forces, for this award.

The department presented one-hundred-eight (108) Chief’s Commendation Certificates in 2014.

Officer Roland Albert, Sergeant Christopher Amsler, Officer Daniel Baginski, Sergeant Susann Baker, Sergeant Matthew Brukbacher, Sergeant Christopher Carleton, Sergeant David Cernich, Officer Diana Cooley, Officer Jeremiah Cooley, Officer Dennis Dempsey, Officer Reginald DePass, Officer Alex Diz, Lieutenant Marcus Dudley, Officer Shane Ellison, Officer Brian Elwood, Officer Matthew Ewert, Officer Mark Finnin, Officer Mark Fitu, Officer Richard Garcia, Officer Brad Graham, Officer Matthew R. Green, Sergeant Michael Haniffin, Agent Patricia Sprows-Hardin, Officer Benjamin Holston, Officer Daniel Iovine, Officer Jeremy W. Jenkins, Sergeant Jon Kessler, Officer Chad Lampson, Lieutenant Christian Lertch, Officer Judy Gurley-Lutkin, Officer Jason McIlrvin, Sergeant Franklin Michelson, Officer Jason Moore, Officer Nicholas Muldoon, Officer Daniel Pell, Agent David Perry, Agent Joseph Petrucelli, Officer Robert Ragain, Sergeant Todd Renner, Officer Cassie Schell, Agent Thomas Sobieski, Officer Chris Stubbings, Officer David Sutherland, Officer Jay Van Kam, Officer Nicole Weiffenbach, Officer David Wells, Agent Robert Wilson, and Officer Patrick Youngquist

On April 18, 2014, at 1100 hours, multiple APD Officers responded to Smoky Hill High School, 16100 E. Smoky Hill Road, on a report of a student who was attempting to ignite an unknown device within the school and stating to others he wanted to blow the school up. Units responded to the scene and quickly located the suspect in a school office where he was found to be covered with an unknown white powder. He also had a backpack in which other suspicious items were located. Officers Shane Ellison and Patrick Youngquist took custody of the student, knowingly exposing themselves to the unknown substance. The school was evacuated and a full response by AFD HAZMAT and other APD Officers occurred. Lieutenant Christian Lertch established incident command and managed the scene. The school was searched thoroughly by multiple APD units utilizing gas masks. ERT Officers Van Kam and McIlrvin donned SCBA units to support HAZMAT with their investigation of the white powder. School Resource Officer Judy Lutkin, who was off sick that day, responded from home on her own accord and assisted with the incident until the conclusion of operations. Sergeant Franklin Michelson, along with Detectives Patricia Hardin, Robert Wilson, David Perry and Thomas Sobieski responded and took control of the criminal investigation. The white powder was determined to be harmless, but the response to the incident was handled in a professional and exemplary manner by all involved. The incident was a fine example of teamwork among all three Districts of APD patrol, special assignments, members of the Investigations Bureau and members of the Aurora Fire Department.
Officer Robert Aragon, Officer Luke Barker, Officer Chad Berger, Officer Daniel Bertelson, Officer John Cassell, Officer Todd Chanos, Officer Todd Elliott, Officer Steven Ficco, Officer Matthew T. Green, Lieutenant Michael McClelland, Sergeant Kevin Rollins, Officer Matthew Springer, and Former Officer Adam Warren

On July 14, 2013, at 1843 hours, APD officers responded to 16486 E. Amherst Ave. on an intoxicated party with a gun (2013-26448). The RP, later identified as Patricia Applehans, advised her husband, David Applehans, suffers from clinical depression and had been drinking beer all day. After an argument with David, she later found him in the garage, sitting in his vehicle with the engine running, apparently attempting to commit suicide. When she confronted David, he exploded in a fit of rage, firing his pistol at the ceiling. Upon arrival, officers quickly set up a perimeter around the house. Patricia advised David was still inside the home with the gun and was very intoxicated. CIT/Negotiator Officer Daniel Bertelson arrived on scene and began communications with David via the phone. After negotiations broke down, Lt. Mike McClelland got on the phone with David, negotiating with him for almost an hour, trying to convince him to come outside. David stated several times he wasn’t coming outside and if we came into his home he would shoot at officers. An arrest team was set up to the east of the residence consisting of Officers Matt T. Green, John Cassell, Chad Elliot, Adam Warren, Steve Ficco and Daniel Bertelson. David came outside several times onto the porch during the negotiations but he retreated back inside upon observing officers pointing guns at him. David continued to threaten he would get his gun and make officers shoot him. During one appearance, Officer Bertelsen discharged his less lethal shot gun, striking David in the midsection twice, but the rounds didn’t seem to affect him. At 2003 hours, David exited his home for the fourth time and continued to ignore orders while screaming at officers. When it appeared David was going back inside once again, Officer Warren discharged his Taser, striking David in the midsection, incapacitating him enough to allow officers to place him into handcuffs and gain custody. Due to the perserverance and patience, a dangerous and volatile situation was controlled and avoided.

Sergeant Damon Vaz

During the winter of 2012, Community Resources Section Sergeant Damon Vaz was confronted with a serious problem which affected numerous school children in the City of Aurora. Some students did not own or have access to proper winter coats and apparel, and were often forced to walk to their schools in sub-zero temperatures. Children were arriving at their schools “in tears” because they were so cold. The majority of these children came from homeless or low income single parent families who were also refugees from foreign countries. Many of these families were simply not prepared for the inhospitable climate Colorado can produce in the wintertime. Sergeant Vaz took it upon himself to research and provide a solution to this serious problem. Sergeant Vaz initiated the “Cops, Coats and Kids Campaign.” This campaign produced over 342 coats and numerous winter hats and gloves which were distributed to the school children in need. The “Cops, Coats and Kids Campaign” continues to grow and facilitate the spirit of giving for the children who need it the most.

Sergeant Damon Vaz is commended and recognized for his charity, good will, professionalism, and community commitment to the children of Aurora. His actions reflect favorably upon himself, the Community Resources Section, the Aurora Police Department and the City of Aurora. Sergeant Damon Vaz is hereby awarded the Chief’s Commendation Certificate.
Officer Roland Albert, Officer Patrick Benda, Sergeant David Cernich, Officer Kevin Chester, Officer Rick Cisneros, Officer Darrin Degen, Officer Jonathan Dennis, Officer Specialist Alfred Eways, Officer Specialist Mike Hawkins, Sergeant Specialist Mark Hildebrand, Sergeant Brian Kelly, Officer Matthew Milligan, Lieutenant Gary Millspaugh, Officer Darnesha Montgomery, Officer Christopher Neiman, Officer Jason Oviatt, Officer Jeffrey Prince, Officer Michael Quirk, Officer Randall Ricks, Sergeant Kevin Rollins, Acting Sergeant Doug Rystrom, Officer Specialist Jake Stull, and Officer Jason Weber

On January 5, 2013, at 0300 hours, APD officers responded to 16005 East Ithaca Place, Unit C, on a report of shots fired. Upon arrival, officers contacted the suspect’s wife who escaped the townhome by jumping out of a second story window. She advised her husband may have just shot her sister, her sister’s boyfriend and her father inside the house and thinks he may have killed himself. Responding officers and patrol supervisors quickly surrounded the residence, set up an inner/outer perimeter and used a patrol car to pin the garage door of the townhome shut to prevent the escape of the suspect. Patrol supervisors also set up a rescue and crisis entry team in the event more shots were fired inside and it became an active shooter incident. Surrounding homes were evacuated and the residents transported to a nearby fire station for safety and security. Telephone contact was established with the barricaded suspect who was delusional and uncooperative, precipitating a SWAT call out. A standoff ensued for approximately six hours under frigid temperatures. The suspect continued to be aggressive and combative, firing at SWAT officers with an assault rifle. After stressful negotiations with the suspect failed and all efforts were made to gain his compliance and surrender, the suspect was shot and killed.

If not for the courageous actions of the first responding officers and supervisors, more innocent lives may have been lost. Their actions reflect great credit upon themselves, the Aurora Police Department and the City of Aurora.

Officer Timothy Eha, Officer Levi Huffine, Sergeant Stephen Jokerst, Sergeant Gerald Jonsgaard, Officer Mason MacDonald, Officer John Moreland, Officer Jeffrey Olson, and Officer David Sanderson

On December 15, 2013, at 0454 hrs, APD officers responded to a man with a gun report in front of 1742 Jamaica Street. The RP related the man with the gun was her boyfriend, Stephen Adams, and he was armed with a shotgun which he had fired in front of the residence two days prior. The RP related Adams had left the scene and gave a vehicle description. Officer Jeffrey Olson found the suspect vehicle and followed it, going in various directions until the suspect drove back to the Jamaica address and parked in front of it. Officers arriving on scene immediately attempted a felony stop and gave orders for Adams to exit the vehicle. Adams, for the next 45 minutes, challenged the officers to shoot him, got in and out of the vehicle, started it and attempted to back up and then go forward. At 0530 hrs, Adams produced a 12-gauge shot gun and pointed it out of the driver’s window at the officers positioned to the left and rear. Officers did not fire at this point and Adams placed the shotgun into his own face and demanded to talk with his girlfriend. Adams again pointed the shotgun at officers out the open window and officers fired, striking Adams several times. Adams was taken into custody without further incident and treated for his wounds. Due to the calm and professional actions of all officers and supervisors involved with this call, a dangerous suspect was taken into custody.
**Officer Faith Goodrich**

In May 2013, Officer Faith Goodrich was assigned to the Special Operations Bureau to specifically work on the Century 16 Theater Shooting After Action Report (AAR). The very same week she was assigned was the first on-site visit by the After Action Team. This team was made up of experts from outside of Colorado and had a very tight and demanding schedule. Faith worked diligently with team members, coordinating interviews, researching reports and getting the team the information they needed to conduct meaningful interviews. In the following months and subsequent visits by the AAR team members, Officer Goodrich coordinated the interviews and corresponded with the team ensuring proper information flow. Faith was instrumental in working with outside agencies to get their participation and cooperation with the AAR and she had the unenviable task of coordinating with some of the victims from the shooting so they could participate in the AAR. In addition to working on the AAR, Officer Goodrich helped the Major Crimes/Homicide Unit with the incident. She helped with the defense’s review of the evidence and performed other tasks as needed by the unit. Officer Goodrich’s willing attitude, attention to detail, professionalism and dedication were then and remain unmatched. She consistently carried out all of her duties which required her to work with inter and intra-agencies.

Officer Goodrich’s work will become a part of the public record and available to the world once the court allows it. Her efforts reflect great credit, not only upon herself, but on the entire Aurora Police Department. Officer Faith Goodrich is hereby awarded the Chief’s Commendation Certificate.

**Officer Tim King**

In September 2013, while assigned to the Aurora Police Department Fugitive Apprehension and Surveillance Team (FAST), Officer Tim King was assigned the task of locating and affecting the arrest of an armed and dangerous criminal who was wanted for serious felony charges. Officer King spent numerous hours performing surveillance on the suspect’s last known locations for over a two week period. During this time, Officer King discovered through informants that the wanted party was becoming increasingly antagonistic with threats against law enforcement personnel and had armed himself with an AK-47 rifle, a handgun, and had obtained a gas mask in the event SWAT attempted to capture him at his residence. On October 1, 2013, Officer King obtained additional information from an informant the suspect was hiding from law enforcement inside of his residence. Due the suspect’s previous criminal history and threats to harm law enforcement personnel, SWAT was activated. After a 10-hour call-out, SWAT did locate and apprehend the wanted party who had attempted to hide inside of the attic of the residence. Due to Officer King’s surveillance and investigation, the Arapahoe County District Attorney’s office raised the bond on this dangerous criminal to $75,000.

Due to the investigative efforts of Officer King, a dangerous criminal was safely apprehended. Officer King’s steadfastness, professionalism and dedication to duty brought great credit upon himself, the Aurora Police Department and the City of Aurora. Officer Tim King is hereby awarded the Chief’s Commendation Certificate.
Chief Marshall Jeffrey Peitersen
Shortly after midnight on March 22, 2014, Jeffrey Peitersen, the Chief Marshal with the Denver County Marshal’s Office, was driving southbound on E470 in his personal vehicle, in an off duty status. At approximately E. 6th Parkway he observed a Honda CRV bearing CO license plate 300TZJ going at a high rate of speed. Peitersen recognized the vehicle and plate from a BOLO robbery bulletin which he recently read, which was put out by the APD District 3 Investigations Unit. The vehicle had been carjacked at a Safeway near Federal Blvd. at E. 26th Ave. on March 20th by a Hispanic male, and later used in two subsequent robberies in Aurora and an attempt kidnapping in Arapahoe County over a 12-hour time period. Peitersen immediately notified the Aurora Police Communication Center and a call for service was generated. Officers Chad Berger and Andy Eways responded to the area and observed the suspect vehicle southbound on E470, going past Smoky Hill Road. A high risk stop was initiated on E470 @ Gartrell Road. The suspect was safely taken into custody without incident. At the Aurora Detention Facility, the suspect was interrogated by APD D3 Detectives, which as a result, gained a full confession from the suspect regarding his violent crime spree in the Metro Denver area.

Due to his superb observation and expeditious communication, Peitersen’s actions led to the capture, arrest and full confession of a violent criminal. Chief Marshal Jeffrey Peitersen is hereby awarded the Chief’s Commendation Certificate.

Officers Daniel Pell and Timothy Eha
On June 4, 2013, at 0258 hours, APD Officer Timothy Eha was performing patrol duties in the area of E. 16th Ave and Peoria St when he observed a silver Jeep Liberty speeding through the area. Officer Eha recognized that the Jeep matched the description of a stolen vehicle recently involved in a City of Denver burglary due to a BOLO he had previously reviewed. As Officer Eha was verifying that the Jeep was stolen, the occupants attempted to elude Officer Eha by driving into a residential area. Officer Eha located the stolen Jeep and discovered the two occupants were still seated inside the vehicle. After completing an initial investigation, Officer Eha discovered that the driver of the stolen Jeep was in possession of methamphetamine drugs, and that the passenger had an active warrant for his arrest. Officer Eha also discovered a large quantity of items inside the stolen vehicle consistent with stolen property from a burglary. APD Officer Daniel Pell, who was also on-scene, performed detailed interviews with the suspects that later implicated both men in past burglaries which had taken place in the City of Aurora as well as Denver.

Through initiative, hard-work and investigative prowess, their actions reflect great credit to themselves and the Aurora Police Department and the City of Aurora. Officer Timothy Eha and Officer Daniel Pell are hereby awarded the Chief’s Commendation Certificate.

Officer Jeffrey D. Prince
On February 26, 2014, a 13-year-old girl was brought into the Children’s Hospital by her parents. The juvenile had run away from home and subsequently been located by her parents. Patrol Officer Jeffrey D. Prince was dispatched on this incident because the child disclosed to her mother that she was sexually assaulted during her absence. During his investigation, Officer Prince was able to obtain from the victim
detailed information as to the area the assault occurred and the suspect vehicle it occurred in. On his own initiative, Officer Prince searched the area the victim described and was able to locate the vehicle at 1035 S. Dearborn Way in a back parking lot. Officer Prince seized the vehicle as evidence and also learned the vehicle was reported stolen during an armed robbery/carjacking a few days prior. Officer Prince notified CAC and EMATT investigators of his findings, along with notifying the victim’s mother.

Due to Officer Prince’s actions of establishing excellent trust and rapport with the victim and her family, along with the self-initiated search and location of the suspect vehicle, Officer Prince obtained critical evidence to assist and help solve several felony related cases. Officer Jeffrey D. Prince is hereby awarded the Chief’s Commendation Certificate.

Volunteer Coordinator Karen Rogers
Administrative Technician Karen Rogers is the Volunteer Coordinator for the Aurora Police Department. One of her primary duties and responsibilities is the large-scale planning of the annual APD Volunteer Awards Banquet. This banquet recognizes the accomplishments of over 400+ volunteers who contribute to the betterment of the APD while saving the City of Aurora hundreds of thousands of dollars annually. Karen begins planning and preparations for this event for the APD volunteers in the preceding September of each year. Most recently, APD hosted the 32nd Annual Volunteer Awards Banquet, with over 300+ people in attendance. Karen routinely invests and dedicates hundreds of hours of planning into this event, ensuring the delivery of professional product in every sense of the word. Her meticulous planning includes the compilation of hours of service by each volunteer, soliciting information from the various APD units and supervisors regarding the accomplishments of their personally assigned volunteers, working closely with other City entities and personnel, ordering of awards, securing of the banquet venue, ordering of banquet prizes, solicitation of door prizes from various local businesses, authoring the multi-paged power point program, proof-reading and ensuring quality control of the volunteer program booklets, mass-mailing of the invitations, testing and ensuring the quality control of the menu items, etc….. Without her dedication, hard work and attention to detail, the volunteers of the Aurora Police Department would not be properly recognized for their valuable contributions. Karen Rogers is a true professional who embraces and embodies the term “Customer Service” and is hereby awarded the Chief’s Commendation Certificate.

Officer Jeremy Sexton
On April 13, 2013, a homicide occurred at Primo’s Bar located at 1443 Clinton Street in the City of Aurora. Investigating Detectives from the Major Crimes Unit (MCU) quickly developed a primary suspect in this case. Efforts included providing security video surveillance footage from the bar, which captured a potential suspect, to members of specialized units within the Aurora Police Department in the hopes that a member may positively identify this suspect and assist in identifying other accomplices involved. Direct Action Response Team Officer Jeremy Sexton reviewed the video and was able to identify a male involved in the incident as being a ‘Ho Hop’ gang member. As a result of Officer Sexton’s investigative actions, MCU was able to confirm the identity of the primary suspect, an accomplice and obtain warrants for their arrests.
Officer Jeremy Sexton’s efforts and dedication in this case significantly assisted MCU’s investigation and reflect great credit upon himself, the Aurora Police Department and the City of Aurora. Officer Jeremy Sexton is hereby awarded the Chief’s Commendation Certificate.

Officer David L. Wells
During his assignment to the District 3 PAR Team, Officer David Wells began witnessing increases in hazardous traffic behavior in Aurora Public School zones and listening to concerns about school traffic safety from school officials, parents, community members and students. Officer Wells took the initiative and adopted an innovative program developed by the Arapahoe County Sheriff’s Office in 2006, to enhance traffic enforcement within school safety zones. The S.T.O.P. program, which stands for “Slow Down, Think, Observe and Proceed with Caution” relies on a partnership between school employees and the APD to identify unsafe traffic behavior and to serve as a notice to motorist who are observed committing violations in school zones. Officer Wells developed an innovative training program to educate school faculty on how the program works, and the process for sending information to the APD in order to notify problem drivers. The S.T.O.P. program has proved so popular with school staff, as well as parents, that the program has expanded to all APS and Cherry Creek elementary schools. The results of this hard work and dedication has contributed to reducing the amount of school zone related accidents and injuries throughout the Aurora Public School system.

Officer Wells’ passion, integrity and commitment to the children of Aurora serve as a reminder to all of us on just how one officer’s initiative can improve the quality of life for so many. Officer David Wells is hereby awarded the Chief’s Commendation Certificate.

Sergeant Christopher J. Amsler
From 2002 to 2013, Sergeant Christopher J. Amsler was instrumental in putting new life back into the Aurora Police Department Police Explorer Program. He played an active role in improving recruitment and retention, increasing the overall number of Explorers in the program. His most recognizable contribution was the creation of the APD Explorer Training Academy. He developed the curriculum, schedules and structure that are currently in place today. This initial training for the Explorer candidates set the standards of learning, character building and professionalism, providing a solid foundation for their time in the program, and to prepare them for future careers in law enforcement. Chris also assisted in creating training programs and competitions used by LEEPAC (Law Enforcement Explorer Post Advisors Association of Colorado). Sgt. Amsler updated old policies and procedures; created an Explorer uniform patch to improve moral and boost esprit de corps; developed an internet webpage, as well as a social media account on Facebook to further expand the reach of the program to the community.

Sgt. Amsler’s years of dedication and service to the Explorers is reflected by the level of motivation and commitment by the members of Aurora Police Explorer Post 2024, who continuously display the highest level of honor, duty and integrity. Sergeant Christopher J. Amsler is hereby awarded the Chief’s Commendation Certificate.
Officer Gary Rogers
Officer Gary Rogers has served as the Aurora Police Department’s lead liaison for the annual Colfax Marathon for many years. This labor intensive position requires many hours of planning, preparation and meetings with race organizers, city government representatives, the Denver Police Department, barricade companies, volunteer groups and the citizens who live in the area that are affected by this major event. The Marathon is a very large event for which Officer Rogers has sacrificed much time and effort to ensure its success. Due to the security concerns created as a result of the Boston Marathon bombing, the 2013 Colfax Marathon demanded even greater time and effort to ensure its safe and efficient implementation. Officer Rogers took it upon himself to plan and implement contingency responses for potential disruptions of the race. He developed action plans with the Office of Emergency Management and he implemented an event staffing plan of over 200 people.

Due to the tireless and diligent efforts of Officer Rogers, the 2013 Colfax Marathon was a tremendous success. Officer Gary Rogers is hereby awarded this Chief’s Commendation Certificate for his professionalism, dedication and exceptional organizational skills.

Management Analyst Jered Elmore
Management Analyst Jered Elmore initiated several important contributions to the progress of the Aurora Police Department while working for the City of Aurora Services Section during calendar year 2013. Jered prepared a spreadsheet for the patrol bid tracking system which improved user interface and order preparation. He also coordinated with the bid committee and created representational imaging of the police patrol districts which provides efficiency during the bidding process and results formulation process. Jered’s diligent efforts for the patrol bid processing were a significant contribution which simplified a very complex process. Jered also implemented the procedures and organization of integrating a collection agency on outstanding Photo Red Light fines for the Aurora Police Department Traffic Section. He coordinated with the Traffic Section and the Photo Red Light system vendor to initiate the Aurora Police Department’s responses required for disputes, as well as managing cases where the identity information was extracted from citizen’s credit reports. His efforts also included systems training, personnel certification, and research of guidelines, laws and evidence packages which streamlined and organized the management of the Photo Red Light system program implementation.

The creative work and diligent efforts of Management Analyst Jered Elmore provided exceptional contributions to the overall mission of the Aurora Police Department. Jered Elmore is hereby awarded the Aurora Police Department Chief’s Commendation Certificate.

Police Agent Charles A. Mehl
On October 29, 1996, Citizen Kimberly Medina was reported as a Missing Person. The initial investigation revealed the circumstances of her disappearance were more than suspicious. Detective Charles A. Mehl was assigned to the case. Over the next 16 years, Detective Mehl worked tirelessly on the case. His investigative efforts took him all across the State of Colorado, collaborating with numerous law enforcement agencies. During the investigation, Kimberly’s husband, Michael Medina became the primary suspect. Through extensive efforts and exhaustive investigative work, Detective Mehl was able
to formulate a solid circumstantial case against the husband. In fact, the case was so comprehensive that the District Attorney’s Office accepted the case for prosecution despite the fact the body of Kimberly Medina was never located. The case rested entirely on the testimony of Detective Mehl. Through a thoroughly prepared investigation and complementary prosecution and the credibility of Detective Mehl on the witness stand, Kimberly’s husband, Michael Medina, was found guilty of First Degree Murder. The Arapahoe County District Attorney George Brauchler and his prosecution team highly praised Detective Mehl for what had just become the second “No-Body” Homicide Conviction in the history of the State of Colorado.

Detective Chuck Mehl’s display of tireless professionalism to investigate this homicide case over a period of 16 years, and to bring resolution to the family of Kimberly Medina, goes far beyond what is expected of members. His actions brought great credit upon himself, the Aurora Police Department and the City of Aurora. Police Agent Charles A. Mehl is hereby awarded the Chief’s Commendation Certificate.

**Senior Management Analyst Christine A. Waters**
Senior Management Analyst Christine A. Waters has performed her budget, finance and accounting duties in an exceptional manner over the past several years. In 2013 she maintained 53 grants and designated fund budgets which can call for applications, allocations, reimbursements, reporting and audits. Chris is called upon to find funding during the year, as well as assuring the Department is within approved budget guidelines. The requests for funding can often make her work tough when being asked to just make it happen. She keeps track of opportunities and exceptions to meet the highest priorities identified for the team. In 2012 Chris assisted the organization by managing an $82 million General Fund budget within $21,113 of that allocation. It didn’t seem like that could get any better until the results of 2013, where an $86 million General Fund expenditure budget was within $1,241 of authorized allocation. Christine certainly gives the Aurora Police Department the most opportunity she can within the financial constraints.

For her dedication to duty and tireless efforts, Senior Management Analyst Christine A. Waters is hereby awarded the Chief’s Commendation Certificate.

**Sergeant Cassidee Carlson**
Sgt. Cassidee Carlson has been assigned to command the Media Relations Unit in the Office of the Chief of Police since November 27, 2010. In the three-plus years of her tenure, the Department has experienced numerous incidents that have garnered extraordinary media focus at the state, national and international level. She has performed exceptionally well in her lead role of managing the image of the Department and its information flow to the media. She is worthy of this special recognition as she leaves the unit for another assignment.

In the immediate aftermath of the July 20, 2012, Century 16 Theater Shooting, Sgt. Carlson managed the Department’s response to an international media event of remarkable magnitude. She did so with a grace, calm, and quiet efficiency that reassured all around her and the entire Aurora community during a period of great tragedy. It is a testament to her skills that the feedback from media professionals around the
world was that the Aurora Police Department handled the information flow as well as any organization could possibly have done under the pressure of such a horrific event. In addition, the special program Sgt. Carlson developed to provide individual media assistance to the families of victims – relying on the expertise of law enforcement PIOs from the region whom she mobilized – has become a national model and standard response by police departments for such mass-casualty events. The exceptional level of professionalism exhibited by the Media Relations Unit has resulted in requests for Sgt. Carlson to provide training or conduct presentations for numerous law enforcement agencies across the country.

Sgt. Carlson has deftly managed all the demands of the Media Relations Unit for three years, skillfully defending the Department from unfair attacks and being exceptionally responsive to individuals and units with the Department who had to go about their important work while under the difficult scrutiny of the media.

For all she has done in her assignment and in recognition of her dedication, professionalism and creativity, Sgt. Carlson is worthy of and hereby recognized with this Chief’s Commendation.
Chief's Unit Citation

The Chief’s Unit Citation may be awarded by the Chief of Police to an entire unit whose members perform their assigned duties in an unusually effective manner. The Chief of Police may recognize units comprised of officers from the Aurora Police Department as well as other organizations, or multi-jurisdictional task forces, for this award.

The department presented nine (9) Chief’s Unit Citations in 2014.

Aurora Public Schools – Security Team
During the winter of 2012, Director of Security for the Aurora Public School System, Tudy Wicks, identified a serious problem which affected the school children in the City of Aurora. Numerous young Aurora Public School students did not own or have access to proper winter coats and apparel, and they were often forced to walk to their schools in sub-zero temperatures. Children were arriving at their schools “in tears” because they were so cold. The majority of these children often came from homeless or low income single parent families who were also refugees from foreign countries. Many of these families were simply not prepared for the sometimes inhospitable climate that Colorado can present in the wintertime. Tudy and her team of security officers took it upon themselves to seek out partners to assist these children in need. Tudy met with APD Community Resource Sergeant Vaz to express her concerns and provide a solution to this serious problem. She assisted Sergeant Vaz in initiating the “Cops, Coats and Kids Campaign” in December of 2012. In the next several months, this campaign produced over 342 coats and numerous winter hats and gloves which were distributed to the school children in need of these vital resources. The “Cops, Coats and Kids Campaign” continues to grow and facilitate the spirit of giving for the children who need it the most.

The Aurora Public Schools Security Team is recognized for their charity, good will, and commitment to the children of our community. They are commended for fostering a partnership with members of the Aurora Police Department for the purpose of helping those who need help the most. Aurora Public Schools Security Team is hereby awarded the Chief’s Unit Citation.

Arapahoe County Sheriff’s Department (Bomb Squad Unit), Denver Police Department, Greenwood Village Police Department, and Special Weapons and Tactics Team (SWAT)
On January 5, 2013, at 0300hrs, members of APD patrol and SWAT responded to the 16000 block of East Ithaca Place on a report of a barricaded suspect that may have shot and killed three people inside. The suspect was aggressive and combative, threatening to fire at officers if they attempted to come inside the townhome. Mutual aid assistance was requested for the operation by SWAT leadership. Without hesitation, three agencies stepped up and delivered resources needed; members of the Arapahoe County Bomb Squad, Denver Police Department, and Greenwood Village Police Department, all responded and made significant contributions of personnel and equipment to this dangerous situation. A decision was made to attempt a breach of the front windows of the townhome in order for insertion of a robot. This exposure would impair the suspect's movements throughout the townhome, and isolate him to a particular area. SWAT officers used the Denver PD Bearcat armored vehicle to accomplish this plan due
to its’ maneuverability. During the breach, the suspect opened fire on SWAT officers, striking the Bearcat with a barrage of .223 rounds. The task was accomplished and it did in fact force the suspect to isolate himself to the second floor area. If not for the protection of the Bearcat armored vehicle, this course of action would not have been possible and serveral officers may have been seriously injured or killed. Negotiations continued to fail and the order was given by the Command Post to go into a “offensive posture” meaning to engage the suspect upon visual contact. SWAT Officers were accompanied to the second floor of the neighboring townhome by members of the Arapahoe County Bomb Squad. Body length ballistic shields, provided by the Greenwood Village Police Department, were used to give the Bomb Squad and SWAT officers some protection from the suspect while creating gunport positions. These gunport positions were created by igniting explosive charges into specific locations on the walls. These charges created large enough observation ports for SWAT officers to see into the suspect’s unit, as well as the ability to engage the suspect with deadly force if needed. A short time later chemical agents were introduced into the townhome and the suspect exposed himself. APD SWAT used deadly force at that time to neutralize the suspect and bring the situation to a close.

If not for the expediant assistance of personnel and equipment by these partnering agencies, the outcome of this deadly situation could have resulted in additional loss of life. Their actions reflect great credit upon themselves and to the law enforcement profession as a whole.

**APD Crisis Negotiation Team (CNT)**

On January 5, 2013, at 0400hrs, APD SWAT responded to the 16000 block of East Ithaca Place on a report of a barricaded suspect that may have shot and killed three people inside. Members of the Crisis Negotiation Team arrived on scene and established telephone contact with the suspect, in which the suspect was quickly determined to be delusional and uncooperative. CNT Officers Cynthia Lengyel and Tracy Rogers, worked as a team to communicate with the suspect, from 0430 until 0847hrs. The suspect continued to be aggressive and combative, threatening to fire at officers if they attempted to come inside. At times the suspect would scream some unintelligible words and then hang up the phone. Numerous requests were made for the suspect to surrender and come out of the home. The suspect’s mental/physical state made it difficult to carry on any meaningful conversation with him. At one point the suspect claimed to be “Jesus,” and he wanted to be referred to as “The Son.” All during these conversations with CNT, members of the SWAT Command Staff, along with Incident Commander Chief Dan Oates, were making decisions based on the suspects demeanor and behavior with CNT. All throughout the negotiations, when the suspect was on the phone, SWAT was put in a “defensive posture.” When the suspect was off the phone, SWAT was placed in a “offensive posture,” meaning to engage the suspect upon visual contact. If not for the stressful and diligent work of the CNT during this incident, these plans and tactics would not have been possible, and valuable information would not have been gained in order to end this horrific event.

The Crisis Negotiation Team is commended for their performance during this incident and are hereby awarded the Chief’s Unit Citation.
APD Emergency Response Team
During the middle part of September (10th-16th) 2013, the City of Aurora along with several other Colorado municipalities and counties experienced a very severe and tragic series of weather events in the form of large quantities of rain which fell in a short period of time. These rain events and the amount of precipitation that fell were described as being comparable to "biblical proportions." The City of Aurora received a total of 15.43 inches of rain over a 7 day period, the result of which was flash flooding which brought the City to a near standstill. In hindsight, this unique weather event was described as "a thousand year flood." Many City streets and intersections became impassable due to either standing or fast-moving water. Neighborhoods began to receive flood damage and virtually every division of City government began fielding requests for assistance and responded to emergency calls for service in order to preserve both life and property. The Aurora Police Department Emergency Response Team was mobilized at 1103 hours on September 12, 2013 and remained "on-the-job" around the clock for the next four days working 12-hour shifts. The leadership of the Emergency Response Team was tasked with deploying ERT resources to various locations within the City in order to accomplish a host of tasks: reduce the amount of people driving into dangerous situations, supplement patrol officers by responding to calls for service directly and indirectly related to the flood waters, manning fixed-post locations at traffic roadblocks, conducted damage-assessments of streets and both public and private property, went door to door in flooded neighborhoods and contacted homeowners as well as conducted welfare checks, deployed high-profile vehicles in flooded neighborhoods and rescued several stranded motorists, directly assisted in the orderly and safe evacuation of a full Cherry Creek Public Schools Elementary School that had been surrounded and cut-off by rising flood waters, handled "size-up" concerns at local water storage areas (reservoirs, as well as retention and "over-flow" ponds, canals, dams, etc...) amongst other tasks. Each member of the Emergency Response Team, many without regard for their own comfort and welfare, graciously came forward and volunteered to assist the citizens and visitors of Aurora when they were needed the most and acted in a very caring and professional manner.

Based upon their actions during the flooding event of 2013, the Emergency Response Team and its members are hereby awarded the Chief's Unit Citation.

Gang Intervention Unit
On April 3, 2013, a gang motivated shooting occurred in the area of E Iliff Ave and S. Buckley Rd. in which two victims were located with serious gunshot wounds. Members of the Aurora Police Department Gang Intervention Unit (GIU) to include Sergeant Michael Gaskill, Agent Larry Martinez, Officer Kevin Rossi, Former Officer Kristopher Johnson, Officer Jeffrey Longnecker, Former Officer Adam Neumeyer, Officer Beau Jacobsen, and Officer Phil Rathbun, responded and initiated an investigation. It was quickly determined that this shooting incident was related to a previous gang related altercation at a different location. Also, through this investigative effort, GIU was able to develop probable cause for the arrest of a known Bloods gang member as the primary suspect for this shooting incident. GIU members then initiated exhaustive investigative and surveillance efforts to locate this suspect over a two day period of time. As a result, the suspect was located and safely placed into custody without incident. Additionally, GIU developed critical intelligence which implicated a second dangerous gang member who had also been
involved in the shooting incident. This suspect was also taken into custody three days later after a second
tireless investigation.

Due to the outstanding professionalism and dedication to duty by the members of the Aurora Police
Department Gang Intervention Unit, two violent and dangerous gang members were identified, located
and apprehended in a timely fashion which made the City of Aurora a safer place. The members of the
Aurora Police Department Gang Intervention Unit are hereby awarded the Chief’s Unit Citation.

Aurora Police Honor Guard Team
The Aurora Police Honor Guard Team has distinguished itself as a symbol of honor, dignity, and
professionalism for the Aurora Police Department for many years. The unit, composed of men and women
volunteers, demands the highest standards and discipline from its members. Due to these high standards
the unit has received numerous praises and accolades throughout its history. When called upon, the
Honor Guard team serves as a tribute to sworn personnel who have devoted their lives with honorable
service, or to those who have made the ultimate sacrifice. Tributes include; firing volleys, playing
ceremonial bagpipes, folding and presenting the American flag to the families, rendering the honor of
Taps, serving as pallbearers, rifle bearers, and presenting State, City, and APD colors.

The Honor Guard participates in local conferences, graduations, local and national police memorials, and
local sporting events for the Colorado Rockies, Colorado Avalanche, and the Denver Broncos
organizations. Members of the team are physically fit, possess impeccable uniform standards, are in good
standing with the Department, have a willingness to perform close quarter drill and ceremony, and
appreciate the meaning of Integrity, Service and Pride.

The APD Honor Guard has worked with diligence and professionalism to bring to the public’s attention
the human side of policing, including the abject pain and sense of loss that is an inevitable part of the
public safety profession. They have committed themselves to be an integral part of the department’s
support mechanism for the families of officers killed or injured in the line of duty.

The Aurora Police Honor Guard Unit is hereby awarded the Chief’s Unit Citation.
Community Commitment Certificate

The Community Commitment Certificate may be awarded by the Chief of Police to members who, through their own efforts, display an unusually effective manner of employing the Aurora Police Department’s community commitment philosophy by providing the public police services which embody the concepts of:

- Police employee/community identification, ownership, and trust or;
- A two-way dialogue between the police organization and the community or;
- A problem-solving approach to the delivery of police services or;
- An attention to those factors that contribute to improving deteriorating conditions in neighborhoods and community or;
- An official recognition of an action-oriented approach to those issues which give rise to fear of crime in the community or of crime in the community or;
- A skilled utilization of the network of governmental and community resources through the use of specific referrals and coordination or;
- An orientation toward the facilitation of community self-help through involvement, knowledge, and organization.

Officer Craig Collins, John Hamam (Aurora Fire Department), Justin Julian (Aurora Fire Department), Terry Malone (Aurora Fire Department), Sergeant Walt Obrecht, and Lieutenant Robert Ott (Aurora Fire Department)

On March 2, 2014, Aurora Fire Department Truck 2 responded on a medical call at the 900 block of Troy Street. The victim, a 90-year-old Alzheimer’s patient, Dorothy Wilkes, was transported by ambulance to University Hospital, where she passed away. AFD contacted APD to standby at the residence with her 90 year old husband, Mr. Jim Wilkes, while the hospital notified him by phone of his wife’s death. Sgt. Walt Obrecht and Officer Craig Collins responded, along with an APD victim advocate, and transported Mr. Wilkes to the hospital to see his wife one last time. The members of AFD Truck 2 volunteered to make the death notification to Mr. Wilkes, as they had responded on previous medical calls for Mrs. Wilkes, and had even shoveled snow off the Wilkes’ driveway and sidewalk on one call. Upon notification, Mr. Wilkes was understandably distraught and told them that he didn’t feel he had much longer to live either as he had suffered a stroke in the past. Upon hearing this, the police officers and firefighters took it upon themselves to visit Mr. Wilkes on numerous occasions in the following days and weeks to check on his welfare, making sure he was caring for himself and keeping his spirits up. Mr. Wilkes was very appreciative of the visits, which no doubt helped his recovery from the loss of his wife of 69 years. Mr. Wilkes contacted the Public Safety Communications Dispatch Center to express his appreciation for the actions of the police officers and firefighters, stating, “The world needs more people like them.” The Lead Tele-communicator who took the call stated she sensed that the officers and firefighters had “saved his life” by offering such compassion.
Certificate of Appreciation – Citizen’s Award

The Certificate of Appreciation, Citizen’s Award may be awarded by the Chief of Police to any citizen who renders valuable, courageous, or heroic assistance to members of the Aurora Police Department.

The department presented two (2) Certificates of Appreciation in 2014.

Jose Cebollos
On September 12, 2013, Aurora Police Officer Michael Moore was working in an off duty capacity at 10190 E. Colfax Ave, US Bank, when he witnessed a vehicle being pushed sideways by a heavy current of flood waters which were a result of a torrential down-pour of rain. Officer Moore noticed that the vehicle being flooded was occupied by two elderly people who were helpless to evacuate themselves from the situation. Mike attempted to rescue the elderly couple but the fast moving current of flood water was too strong to maneuver through alone. Aurora Citizen Jose Cebollos observed Officer Moore’s efforts and immediately proceeded to his location to assist. Officer Moore and Jose Cebollos moved through the flooded roadway, working together as a team to open the doors of the flooded vehicle. With great effort, they extracted the elderly couple one at a time, making two trips through the flooded roadway, and moving the couple to a safe area where they received medical attention. The elderly couple was later released from the scene without any significant injuries related to the incident. Due to the courageous and cooperative teamwork of Officer Moore and Jose Cebollos, the victims were able to escape this dangerous, life threatening situation without harm.

Jose Cebollos displayed great courage and bravery with his willingness to assist his fellow citizens and the Aurora Police Department without regard for his own personal safety. Jose Cebollos is hereby awarded the Certificate of Appreciation – Citizen’s Award.

Tasha M. Ewing (USPS)
On April 15, 2014 at 1115 hours, United States Postal Service Letter Carrier Tasha M. Ewing was in the area of 15374 E. 7th Circle delivering mail. Tasha observed a garage door to the residence open and a red in color Ford Taurus pull out. A young male walked out the front door of the home and got into the back seat of the vehicle and it drove away. When she approached the front door area she observed the glass by the door was broken out. She immediately called APD and advised what she had just observed, giving detailed descriptions of the suspects and the vehicle. A short time later, APD Officers spotted the suspect vehicle and attempted to stop it. The vehicle fled at a high rate of speed into an apartment complex but ran out of roadway and the three occupants fled on foot. Other officers in the area arrived and a perimeter was established. A short time later, two of the suspects had been detained and taken into custody. Tasha was transported to the scene and positively identified the vehicle as the one that left the house earlier. Items inventoried from the Ford Taurus, which was a reported steal as well, were determined to be stolen from the home. The items recovered were valued at over $7,000 dollars. Due to Tasha’s keen observations, two dangerous criminals were arrested and the stolen property returned to its rightful owners. Tasha M. Ewing is commended for her actions which contributed to the betterment of the City of Aurora, making it a safer place to live for its citizens.
Informal Commander’s Commendations

Commander’s Commendation Certificate

The Commander’s Commendation Certificate may be awarded by Section and Bureau Command Officers to those members who, through their own efforts, perform their jobs in such a manner as to reflect high quality and professionalism in performance of their duties.

The department issued one-hundred thirty-three (133) Commander’s Commendations in 2014.

Officer Bryan Bergstrom, Officer William Collom, Officer David Wilson, Officer Jeremy J. Jenkins, Officer Thomas Muldoon, and Officer Adam Roberts

On April 2, 2014, District 1 officers responded to a reported strong arm robbery which occurred in the 1200 block of S Havana Street. Responding officers checked the area for the two suspects. Officer Jenkins located a subject walking behind a buisness who vaguely matched the suspect description. Upon investigating further, Officer Jenkins observed the subject place something in a bush and flee on foot. Officer Jenkins recovered the victim’s $525.00 cash from the bush and located video surveillance capturing the subject’s actions.

Officer Wilson located the subject two blocks away who was detained with the assistance of Officer Roberts and Officer Bergstrom. Officer Collom contacted the victim and led the investigation. Officer Johnson assisted with searching for evidence and recovered video surveillance from the Sprint store. Officer Muldoon contacted witnesses and conducted the field identification show-ups. A witness positively identified the detained subject as the suspect in the robbery. Officer Wilson, recognizing the victim’s wallet was still missing, started a thorough search for the evidence.

Officer Wilson began checking trash cans inside King Soopers and located the victim’s wallet in the men’s restroom. Officer Jenkins was instrumental in returning the money and wallet to the victim. After consultation with a detective and the DA it was determined that the evidence/property could be throughly documented and returned to the victim.

Based on the hardwork and determination of these officers, all of the victim’s property was recovered and the main suspect was located and arrested. The successful resolution to this call was the result of the outstanding teamwork displayed by every officer on this call. The initiative, hard-work, determination, and teamwork displayed by these officers is to be commended. They exemplify the key values of the Aurora Police Department and they provided a great service to the citizens of Aurora.

Officer Paul Davis, Officer Chad Elliott, Officer Darryll Huntsman, and Officer Matthew Neely

On April 15, 2014, at about 1600 hours, Officers Chad Elliott and Paul Davis were investigating a traffic violation near the 14100 block of E. Colfax Avenue, while doing so they observed a physical disturbance about 150-feet east of the traffic investigation. Officer Elliott ran to the location as Officer Davis followed in his police vehicle. Officer Elliott quickly determined that the disturbance was actually a robbery in progress. The victim of the robbery was beaten and pushed face first into a brick wall.
A foot pursuit ensued with the suspects eventually taken into custody with the assistance of other responding officers. A thorough investigation conducted by Officers Elliott, Davis, Neely, and Huntsman concluded in the arrest and jailing of three robbery suspects.

The quick recognition and intervention by Officers Davis and Elliott spared the victim further injury and the eventual recovery of his stolen cellular phone. The subsequent investigation by Officers Elliott, Davis, Neely, and Huntsman resulted in violent criminals incarcerated and a solid criminal case entered into the court system.

**Officer Bret Iske, Officer Jeremiah Miles, and Officer Richard Romero**

On June 30, 2014, at approximately 1830 hours, Officers Bret Iske, Jeremiah Miles, and Richard Romero responded to investigate a theft in progress which was later determined to be a robbery of a 7-11 store patron at 10201 E Montview Blvd. The suspect forcibly took about $100 cash from the victim inside the store as he attempted to buy items at the counter. A witness and friend of the victim followed the suspect demanding that the suspect return the money. The suspect then brandished a small black handgun to stop the witness from following him.

Officer Iske reviewed the surveillance video and developed suspect and suspect vehicle descriptions and aired this information to other officers. Later, while Officers Miles and Romero were completing this offense report, they observed the suspect travel by in the suspect vehicle. They conducted a high-risk stop on the vehicle, and the suspect, a known Crip gang member with a lengthy criminal history, was taken into custody without incident at 23rd and Emporia. Victim and witness both positively identified the suspect. The officers are commended for their teamwork, investigative skills, and observational skills, which led to the arrest of a violent felon.

**Officer Lisa Calcamuggio, Officer Jason Capper, Sergeant Cassidee Carlson, Officer Gerald Medina, Officer John Moreland, and Officer Donald Wilcox**

On August 22, 2014, at approximately 1945 hours, officers responded to the 1400 block of Ursula Street on a report of a male subject that was on top of a 7-story parking structure. The male reportedly stated to someone on the ground below, “do you want to see me fly?” Sgt. Carlson arrived on scene first and made the initial contact with the male. The male was sitting on the edge of the wall with his body facing toward the outside of the garage and he had one leg hanging off the wall and the other tucked in. A short time later Officer Medina, who is CIT certified, arrived and took over talking to the male and developing a rapport with him. Officers Calcamuggio, Capper, Wilcox, and Moreland soon arrived on the roof and started assisting.

The male stated that he wanted to commit suicide because he was depressed and nobody cared about him. He continued to tell officers not to move closer or he would jump. Officers Calcamuggio and Wilcox, who are CIT certified, also started talking to the male. Officer Medina and Sgt. Carlson worked on building trust with the male so that they could move closer to him. After about 30 minutes of talking to the male, Officer Calcamuggio was able to obtain a phone number for an out of state relative from him. She was able to establish phone contact with his sister and asked him to please get off the ledge so that he could
talk to his sister. This was eventually successful. After talking on the phone with his family, he was transported to the hospital for a mental health hold.

All officers on scene did an excellent job working together. Each officer displayed patience and discipline throughout this incident which resulted in a successful resolution.

Officer Tony Cancino and Officer Mark Lowisz
Officers Tony Cancino and Mark Lowisz, while assigned to the District One B.I.G. Unit, were able to determine a pattern of business burglaries. The surveillance videos of about 6 burglaries were reviewed and all contained one party consistently wearing a distinctive rugby striped hoodie. Through the gathering of intelligence of known burglars in the area and searching through several Facebook pages, these officers believed they had identified the owner of this striped hoodie. Officer Cancino authored a search warrant for the party’s address and led the efforts in a tactical operation with PAR, DART, and SWAT teams.

The results of this operation yielded, not only the seizure of the striped hoodie, but also the arrest of the striped hoodie owner/wearer, an extensive confession of burglaries involving 12 businesses (including information of 3 co-defendants) and the confiscation of several items of stolen property not listed in the original search warrant, after gaining written permission from the juvenile and his mother. This was a fantastic job with well over and above normal results.

Officer Randall Carroll
On July 9, 2012, at approximately 0215 hours, Officer Carroll responded to a call for a CIT officer needed in regards to a suicidal party that was on the phone with the suicide hotline, had a knife in her hand and was hanging out a third story window threatening to jump. An emergency entry team was assembled as Officer Carroll began speaking with the subject at the doorway.

The suicidal party was yelling and acting irrationally and was obviously experiencing significant emotional trauma. Using his CIT skills Officer Carroll took the time necessary to talk with the distressed party and was able to develop a rapport with her.

Officer Carroll did an outstanding job using his listening skills, which in turn resulted in the suicidal party developing a trust with Officer Carroll. Officer Carroll convinced the suicidal party that suicide was not the answer and that he could assist her in obtaining resources which could help to alleviate the temporary trauma that she was experiencing. Through his patience, diligence, and training Officer Carroll ensured that a very volatile situation did not get worse. The suicidal party was eventually taken into protective custody and received the help that she needed. Officer Carroll is recognized for his service to the community on that day.

Officer Jeffrey Olson and Officer Delbert Tisdale
During the early morning hours of June 14, 2014, Officer Jeffrey Olson and Officer DJ Tisdale were in the area of E. Montview Blvd. and Clinton St. searching for suspects who had been involved in an armed robbery in the area. Officer Olson observed an individual who matched the suspect description near the area of E. Montview Blvd. and Chester St. Officer Olson approached the suspect, later identified as Antwyon Pierce and initiated contact. Officer Tisdale arrived on scene to assist and cover Officer Olson.
During the contact, Pierce provided a false name but Officer Olson discovered that this name and mug shot did not match Pierce’s description. Officer Olson performed a pat down search for weapons on Pierce but this male began to act in an agitated manner. At one point Pierce turned his body and pulled his hands down as if he was trying to escape from the officers. The officers were able to take Pierce to the ground and during this process, Officer Olson heard a heavy metal object fall from Pierce’s body. Both officers then realized it was a handgun that had become dislodged from Pierce’s midsection during the struggle.

Officers Olson and Tisdale were able to hold Pierce on the ground while requesting additional officers to assist in completing the arrest. Other personnel soon arrived and Pierce was placed into custody without further incident. Officers Olson and Tisdale not only displayed alert and proactive policing techniques, but successfully seized a loaded firearm from a known gang member, thus preventing this individual from victimizing other citizens of Aurora.

**Officer Richard Ray**
On February 22, 2014, Officer Ray responded to 9350 E. Colfax Avenue on the report of a burglary. Officer Ray had found the business to be burglarized by entering a window to the business and learned from the owner that numerous lottery tickets were taken. Officer Ray was in contact with state lottery investigators and learned some of the tickets had been cashed at the 7-11 located at 4805 E. Mississippi in Denver. Officer Ray responded there and observed the suspect on video to be wearing a Finish Line Car Wash shirt. Officer Ray responded to the car wash at 1160 S. Colorado Blvd and was advised that the party in the video did work there and was identified by the manager. Officer Ray continued to follow up the case the next week and found lottery tickets from the burglary in the suspect’s residence. Additionally, Officer Ray located the suspect and arrested him reference the burglary. Officer Ray’s tenacity and follow up in this case is to be commended.

**Officer Paul Seiwald**
On February 25, 2014, officers responded to 9742 E. Colfax Avenue on the report of a verified alarm. Upon arrival, officers observed a party inside the restaurant who then went to the rear of the business. Upon getting to the rear of the business, the suspect was observed running from the business to the south. Officer Paul Seiwald pursued the suspect on foot and eventually tackled him in the 1400 block of Dayton Street. It was later learned that the suspect broke out the rear door and entered the business. Items from the burglary were recovered and a full confession was obtained from the suspect. Officer Seiwald is to be commended for his work on this case.

**Officer Stephenson Cary, Officer Timothy Eha, Officer William Hummel, Officer Richard Romero, and Officer Robert Wong**
On the evening of September 9, 2014, Officers Tim Eha, William Hummel, Stephenson Cary, Robert Wong, and Richard Romero responded to consecutive reports of in progress burglaries at 2848 S. Kenton Ct., 11185 E. Linvale Dr. and 2759 S. Lansing St. Information was aired that the suspect was armed with a knife or other simulated weapon, and he had assaulted and menaced victims in their homes. The suspect was known to be violent and was actively forcing his way into victims’ homes while Officers were in the area conducting investigations. Additional officers assisted in setting up a perimeter to try and contain and locate the suspect.
Officer Eha located the suspect, and with the assistance of Officer Romero, engaged in a foot pursuit that culminated in a physical struggle while taking the violent suspect into custody. The above Officers took the lead on the complex investigation and demonstrated effective teamwork by working together to conduct thorough investigations at multiple crime scenes with multiple victims. The investigations revealed that the suspect had committed the crimes of Attempted Sex Assault, 2nd Degree Kidnapping, 1st Degree Burglary and Felony Menacing in a short period of time. The officers’ quick response to the crime scenes, thorough investigations, effective communication and teamwork enabled them to quickly stop the suspect’s violent rampage through the community before any citizens were seriously injured.

**Officer Richard Martinez and Officer Carlos Wilkendorf**

On the evening of September 9, 2014, District One Officers Richard Martinez and Carlos Wilkendorf responded to the 1500 Block of Nome Street regarding an in-progress sex assault on a child. The mother of a 12-year-old girl was reporting that the mother’s boyfriend had just sexually assaulted her daughter. Information was also learned that the suspect had wrecked into another vehicle in the parking lot near the apartment complex as he was fleeing the scene.

Officer Martinez observed the suspect vehicle, stopped him before he could make his escape and subsequently took him into custody. Officer Martinez continued to focus on the investigation by using his knowledge and experience to gain a recorded confession from the suspect under Miranda. Officer Martinez also collected essential items of evidence from the suspect to build a solid case.

Simultaneously with Officer Martinez’s actions, Officer Wilkendorf responded to the scene, located the victim/witness and immediately began the investigation. Officer Wilkendorf responded to the hospital with the mother and her daughter where he was able to build a rapport with them under stressful and highly emotional circumstances. This relationship allowed Officer Wilkendorf to document essential facts, and collect important evidence needed to establish the elements of the sexual assault.

Officer Martinez’s quick response to the scene enabled him to capture a fleeing suspect that posed a great risk to the safety of children in the community if not immediately apprehended. The efforts of Officer Martinez and Officer Wilkendorf during this complex investigation are a credit to their work ethic and their commitment to the safety of the community.

**Officer Michael Moore, Officer Clark Orchard, Officer Patricia Perea, and Officer Paul Seiwald**

On September 16, 2014, Officer Patricia Perea was notified by a citizen that suspicious items were located in the alley east of the 2300 block of N Florence. Officer Perea later located two individuals who were believed to have been in the possession of the items. One of the males ran from Officer Perea. Officers Clark Orchard, Paul Seiwald, and Mike Moore responded to assist. Officer Seiwald located the male running towards him and ordered him to stop. The male kept running, climbing fences, and entering backyards. Officer Orchard observed the male running through the backyards and attempted to head him off. The male saw Officer Orchard in an alley and changed direction again until he was stopped by Officer Moore and the officers were able to take the male into custody. Both males eventually admitted to detectives that they had burglarized a house in the neighborhood. Officer Seiwald went to the house and made contact with the homeowner. Multiple items were discovered to be missing from the home, many
of which were found in the possession of the suspects. The males both later confessed to detectives to committing the burglary.

Officers Clark Orchard, Mike Moore, and Paul Seiwald worked well as a team to catch the suspect that ran. Officer Seiwald investigated the burglary and was able to link key pieces of evidence to the suspects, which ultimately was used against them in interviews, resulting in confessions.

**Officer Roland Albert, Sergeant David Cernich, Officer Jeremy Cooley, Officer Brad Graham, Officer Nick Muldoon, Officer Daniel Pell, and Officer Scott Wicklund**

On January 30, 2014, District 1 Officers responded to Ed Bozarth Chevrolet on a report of a stolen MDC from a District Two marked patrol car. It was learned that a male identified as Jesse Garis, had dropped off his personal vehicle to have it repaired at the same dealership. Jesse and his associate were captured on surveillance video, taking the keys from the parked patrol vehicle. They were later recorded climbing the fence to the closed business and breaking into the patrol car, stealing the MDC and other miscellaneous items. District 2 DART was tasked with locating the stolen MDC before the end of their shift. Officers were given the name of Jesse, who they learned was gang member and currently on Federal Probation for weapons related offenses. Officers began investigating his whereabouts and located a possible address. The DART officers began conducting surveillance in the area and later contacted a 2008 Chevy Trailblazer that was believed to be occupied by Jesse. They contacted Jesse and found him to be in possession of a “Norinco” SKS (7.62) Assualt Rifle with a fully loaded 24-round magazine. A search of the vehicle also gleaned 7.3ggw of methamphetamine in the back seat. After a thorough interview of Jesse, the location of the computer was learned along with the identity of the second suspect. Jesse showed the officers the address in Denver where the computer was last seen. After a pre-text phone call to his associate, officers were able to locate the MDC in the bushes in the complex. Jesse then arranged a pre-text meeting with the second suspect who was also arrested. He was found to be in possession of 3.8 ggw of heroin. Jesse was charged with POWPO and Possession of Methamphetamines. The initative, hardwork, and investigative prowess displayed by all members involved, is to be commended. They exemplify the key values of the Aurora Police Department and provided a great service to the citizens of Aurora.

**Officer Alex Diz and Officer Craig Hess**

On November 15, 2013, Officer Craig Hess and Alex Diz, working a two-officer car, observed a vehicle northbound on S. Buckley Road traveling towards them at an unusually slow speed. The observed vehicle was also swerving in its lane repeatedly striking the east curb. As the vehicle approached the officers, they observed the driver slumped over in the seat and appeared to be unconscious.

Officer Hess immediately activated the emergency equipment on his car and positioned his patrol car in front of the runaway vehicle as it approached the driveway into a strip mall. Officer Hess slowed his vehicle and allowed the two vehicles to make a controlled contact, bringing the runaway car to a stop merely yards away from a rock-lined drainage ditch. Due to the path the runaway vehicle was on, if Officer Hess had not responded so quickly and brought the car to a stop, the vehicle would have undoubtedly ended up in the drainage ditch, causing significant damage to the car as well as injury to the unconscious driver.
Fire/Rescue was requested for an undetermined medical problem the female driver was experiencing. Drugs and alcohol were later ruled out and she was released to a family member. Due to the quick response of Officers Craig Hess and Alex Diz, a potentially dangerous situation was thwarted.

**Officer Mel Cobb**

On April 17, 2014, Officer Mel Cobb responded to a bank robbery that had just occurred. While enroute, a description was aired over the radio to the responding officers of a suspect, who was running on foot towards the K-Mart store. Officer Cobb advised dispatch that he would be inside the K-Mart store checking for the suspect. Officer Cobb went inside the restroom and observed the suspect standing by the sink counter. Officer Cobb watched the suspect lay a camouflage shirt on the counter and change into street clothes. Officer Cobb also observed a large amount of money lying on the counter next to the suspect. Officer Cobb drew his weapon and ordered the suspect to put his hands behind his head. The suspect then made a spontaneous statement about how he should not have robbed that bank. The suspect was taken into custody with the assistance of cover officers. It was later determined that the suspect was wanted for parole violation and bank robbery out of Milwaukee. The suspect also later confessed to a bank robbery in Vail, Colorado.

Officer Cobb should be commended for his investigative skills, the professional manner in locating the suspect, and recovering the needed evidence. Officer Cobb’s experience led him to where he believed the bank robber would hide. It should be noted that because of Officer Cobb’s demeanor with the suspect, and after advisement, the suspect openly admitted to other bank robberies.

**Detective Brandon Rinnan**

In December 2013, there were a string of business robberies which spanned all three districts. Two cases from District 2, one case from District 1, and the last case in District 3. All had similarities. Through the investigative prowess of Det. Rinnan, he determined that these violent armed robberies appeared to be a pattern, possibly committed by the same individuals. All of the robberies included a male who was armed with a black semi-automatic handgun, wearing white latex gloves, and who would carry in his own bag. The suspect was coined the name “Bring Your Own Bag Bandit” (BYOB).

Det. Rinnan completed a flyer containing photos of the suspect which were submitted to Crime Stoppers and were also aired on the local news channels. The flyers resulted in numerous leads through Crime Stoppers, which Det. Rinnan diligently followed up on. He was able to determine the suspect in those cases was Bobby Givens and his female accomplice was Irene Contreras. District 2 DART was tasked with locating both Bobby and Irene, which they did. Det. Rinnan interviewed Irene, who confessed to assisting Bobby in three of the four robberies. Bobby invoked his right to an attorney and refused to talk to Detectives. They were both arrested and held for the four outstanding aggravated robberies.

The initiative, hard work, and investigative prowess displayed by Det. Rinnan is to be commended. He exemplifies the key values of the Aurora Police Department and provided a great service to the citizens of Aurora.
Officer Roland Albert, Sergeant David Cernich, Officer Jeremiah Cooley, Officer Darryll Huntsman, Officer Daniel Pell, Officer Jack Valentine, and Officer Scott Wicklund

On October 4, 2013, Sergeant Mike Gaskill from Aurora GIU advised the members of the District 2 DART Team of a male party wanted on a felony warrant living in District 2. He advised them that Wesley Pappas is a known gang member with an extensive violent criminal history and was wanted for threatening to kill a Denver Police Gang Officer after the officer testified in District Court. The Officer testified in the Attempted 1st Degree Murder and 1st Degree Assault case of Westminster Police Officer Derek Rogers. The Jefferson County District Attorney’s Office filed charges and had a warrant issued on Pappas for Intimidation of a Witness and set the bond at $100,000.

On October 5, 2012, the District 2 DART Team conducted surveillance at Pappas’ address in District 2. They spent the entire day conducting surveillance and research on Pappas in an attempt to locate him. As a result of their investigative skills they learned of an associated address at 1366 Garfield Street in Denver. While maintaining surveillance at his residence in Aurora other members of the team went to the address in Denver. As they were driving by the residence in Denver they observed Pappas in the driver’s seat of a work van. It appeared as though Pappas was going to leave and an impromptu plan was developed and implemented to assault the vehicle before he could leave. Pappas was taken into custody without incident and turned over to the Denver Police Department.

The initiative, hard-work, and investigative prowess displayed by the members of the Team is to be commended. They exemplify the key values of the Aurora Police Department and provided a great service to the citizens of Aurora.

Officer Jordan Odneal, Officer Randall Ricks, Officer Gene Vandyk, and Officer Matt Wyche

Officers Matt Wyche, Gene Vandyk, Randall Ricks, and Jordon Odneal responded to a stabbing at the Baron Rojo Bar on March 16, 2014. After conducting their investigation at the scene, the officers were able to locate witnesses and evidence. The suspect and his vehicle had previously fled the scene. Through great observation and investigation, the officers obtained a full confession from the suspect. He was subsequently charged with 2nd Degree Assault. This was excellent teamwork on the part of the officers to quickly apprehend a dangerous suspect and assist filing detectives by conducting a thorough preliminary investigation.

Officer Craig Hess and Officer Robert Little

On October 27, 2014, Aurora Police District 2 Officers Robert Little and Craig Hess were dispatched to the Target store on E. Ellsworth Avenue. A thief had just stolen the purse of a citizen shopping in the store.

Officers Little and Hess found that an 86-year-old Aurora resident had been shopping while a young adult male had shadowed her actions. When the opportunity presented itself, the brazen thief stole her purse and fled the store. The victim lost her identification, credit card, and keys for her vehicle and home. She was shopping for her blind 90-year-old husband and was shaken by this crime.

Officers Little and Hess immediately obtained the investigative information and surveillance images of the crime. But, they went much further than standard police protocol.
The officers immediately cancelled all of the woman’s stolen cards and identification. They completed the victim’s shopping and paid for the goods out of their own pocket. Officers Little and Hess drove her home and obtained an alternate set of keys. They then returned to the store to retrieve her vehicle and bring it to her residence.

During the process, Officers Little and Hess also bought new deadbolts for the elderly couple’s home and then installed them. This combination of acts reflected a deep sense of duty, honor, and integrity. By their unusual attention to duty and through their own efforts, Officers Little and Hess displayed the highest standards of professionalism.

**Officer Antony Green and Officer Candice Iovine**

Officer Candice Iovine responded to a routine harassment call between a tenant and the apartment staff. This routine call turned into a two-day struggle to help a violent and potentially dangerous military veteran who was in severe crisis. The veteran was making homicidal threats towards Officer Iovine’s partner during their initial contact. Officer Iovine was able to use her CIT skills and training, along with her life skills and military background to build a rapport with veteran to get him stabilized so she could work on a type of placement for him. Officer Iovine could not obtain a mental health professional to commit the veteran. She feared for the veteran’s safety and the safety of fellow officers who would likely have to respond to his address over the weekend, almost certainly encountering a violent and combative situation. When the veteran was told she could not get him into a facility he began making threats that he would assault anyone who came to his door. While on the phone with the veteran she coordinated with dispatch, responding officers, and family members until he was safely secured for transport to the hospital. Officer Antony Green was one of the responding officers to the veteran’s residence. Officer Green was able to get the veteran to go to the hospital via a patrol car, avoiding an ambulance trip. Officer Green thoroughly informed the hospital staff of the veteran’s potentially violent and dangerous behavior. The responding officers’ commitment, dedication, and teamwork in helping a member of our community who was in severe crisis, while avoiding a potentially dangerous encounter/confrontation with other citizens and officers is recognized and appreciated.

**Officer Kevin Chester and Officer Ryan Sweeney**

On June 15, 2014, District 2 Patrol Officer Kevin Chester stopped a vehicle for speeding and other traffic violations. Officer Chester determined that the driver was possibly DUI. Officer Sweeney arrived to assist with the traffic stop. After conducting subsequent roadside sobriety tests, they arrested the driver for DUI and outstanding warrants. Officer Sweeney conducted a vehicle inventory and located a scoped hunting rifle in the trunk. He recognized that rifle by description as potentially stolen from a District 3 burglary bulletin. Both officers diligently continued the burglary investigation and obtained incriminating statements from the driver of the vehicle regarding the burglary. Through their own initiative and professionalism, and attention to detail, Officers Chester and Sweeney assisted in resolving this burglary case and recovering stolen firearms.
Officer Diana Cooley, Officer Alex Diz, Officer Michael Dziurgot, Officer Candice Iovine, Officer Tim Jeffrey, Officer Jason McIrvin, and Officer Jay Van Kam

An observant postal employee noticed a suspicious vehicle pull out of a garage. The front door was left open and the window next to the door was broken. She called 911 on her cell and advises a partial plate, along with a vehicle description with three occupants. Officers McIrvin and Van Kam located the vehicle southbound on Chambers Road. When the officers attempted to stop the car the driver pulled into an apartment complex, stopped the car, and fled on foot. Officers Diz and Iovine quickly captured one occupant. Another ran across the Highline Canal and into the neighborhood near Exposition and Jasper. Officer Jeffrey located one of the suspects in the backyard bordering the canal. The vehicle the suspects were operating turned out to be stolen out of Aurora two days prior. Both arrestees were juvenile males.

Agent Jamie Krieger responded to the scene and had the following to say about all the officers involved in the apprehension and investigation of this incident: “I've worked with Van Kam, McIrvin, Cooley, Iovine, Diz, Dziurgot, and Jeffrey before, and I know they are good at what they do.” Officer Jim Gentry was also instrumental in his efforts and they all went above and beyond for this case. We have been experiencing a significant rise in residential burglaries, primarily committed by juveniles who aren't attending school. The two juveniles arrested had a lengthy history and the case against the both of them is solid. Everything the team did helped make sure a solid case was submitted to the District Attorney’s office. These officers are to be commended for their professionalism, spirit of cooperation, and dedication to making District 2 a safer place for our citizens.

Officer Jonathan Carelock, Officer Melvin Cobb, Sergeant Michael Hanifin, Officer Tim Jeffrey, Officer Jason McIrvin, Officer Jay Van Kam, and Sergeant Steven White

On January 28, 2014, Officers were dispatched to a call of burglary in progress where the suspects were armed with guns and injured victims inside the home. Officer Carelock was first to arrive on scene and had observed four possible suspects leaving the residence carrying electronics. Officer Carelock was able to give descriptions of the suspects and direction of travel before they fled on foot. He gave them orders to stop. He then chased the suspects and was able to detain and arrest one suspect. Sgt. White was in the area setting up a perimeter, he observed one of the suspects walking along a street. He immediately gave chase in an attempt to detain the suspect. The suspect had jumped over fences and was now in an apartment complex. Sergeants White and Hanifin and Officer Jeffrey immediately searched on foot for the suspect. Sgt. Hanifin received information that the suspect had run into an apartment. With the information given and noticeable foot prints leading into the apartment, Sergeant Hanifin and White, Officer Jeffrey and Cobb gained consent to enter the apartment where two suspects were detained and arrested. The fourth suspect was still at large. Officer McIrvin and Van Kam followed foot tracks that led to a pile of clothing matching the description of the clothing that the suspects were wearing. The foot tracks led to a drainage aqua duct that was divided into two tunnels. They continued to search the area and Officer Van Kam found other drainage pipes. Officers Van Kam and McIrvin were able to locate the fourth suspect in one of those drainage pipes. When they found the last suspect, he was suffering from hypothermia due to the cold weather and water in the drainage pipes. He was provided medical attention and was transported to the hospital. As a result of the diligent and persistent work tracking down these violent criminals, stolen items were recovered and all four of the suspect were safely taken into custody.
Officer Amber Buck, Officer Edward Clements, Officer Jordan Odneal, Officer Jason Weber, and Officer Matthew Wyche

On May 4, 2014, Officers Amber Buck, Jason Weber, Ed Clements, Matt Wyche, and Jordan Odneal responded to the 18000 block of Arizona Avenue on the report of a structure fire. Upon arrival, Officers Buck and Weber observed that the unit was engulfed in flames. Officers Buck and Weber quickly began evacuating the adjoining units in case the fire spread. Officer Odneal, Wyche, and Clements blocked the streets coming into the condominiums and directed arriving fire personnel to the location of the structure fire. Officers Odneal and Clements kept the roads free and clear so that all of the fire engines, trucks, and ambulances had quick access to the area of the structure fire. On separate occasions, these officers’ supervisors were contacted by two AFD Battalion Chiefs, One AFD Captain, and two AFD Lieutenants, who commended the officers on an excellent job. They advised the officers who cleared the streets provided them with quick access to the fire, and they were able to get water on the fire immediately upon their arrival. They advised Officers Buck and Weber did an excellent job evacuating residents in the building. The collaborative efforts of these officers likely saved the lives of the residents and allowed the fire department to quickly put out the fire before it could spread to additional units. These officers are commended for their dedication and professionalism.

Officer Jay Van Kam and Officer Jason McIrvin

On November 14, 2013, Officer Jason McIrvin and Jay Van Kam were working a special enforcement operation in the Mississippi Ave/Sable Blvd area of District 2. They decided to spend some time patrolling some of the surrounding neighborhoods near the target enforcement operation area as they were recently hit hard by burglaries. They observed a male walking the neighborhood who was previously known to them as being incarcerated for larceny from motor vehicles. They made a consensual contact with Micaiah Roberts and started having a casual conversation with him. They began to get suspicious feelings that something with him just wasn’t quite right. They subsequently found numerous items on his person, which were later confirmed to be recently stolen, including a financial transaction device. Upon further investigation, their suspicions were heightened. As a result of this seemingly routine street contact, Mr. Roberts later confessed to multiple burglaries and larceny from motor vehicles. A search warrant was executed by detectives, which resulted in the recovery of many stolen items. Because these officers were familiar with their area and who does and does not belong, they made a contact which ended up clearing up multiple unresolved burglary cases within the District.

Officer Diana Cooley and Officer Michael Dziurgot

On February 20, 2014, Officers Michael Dziurgot and Diana Cooley were working a special enforcement operation in the area of Mexico Avenue and Buckley Road due to recent burglaries in both Districts 2 and 3. There were approaching S. Buckley Road and S. Pagosa Way when they observed three parties crossing the landscaped median, failing to use the crosswalk. The parties also changed their direction after observing the patrol car. The two officers contacted the parties and one was recognized from a recent BOLO as Damian Castle White, who was wanted in reference to multiple burglaries in District 1. They also contacted a juvenile female who had liquor in her purse, and recognized that this could be evidence from a recent burglary at the Bottle Barn in District 2. After further investigation, both parties were arrested at the scene. As a result of this seemingly routine street contact, Castle White subsequently confessed to multiple burglaries across all three Districts, including one at Bottle Barn. Because these officers were
familiar with what was occurring in the area and paying attention to resources supplied by detectives, their work assisted in clearing multiple unresolved burglaries.

**Officer John Cassell and Agent Michael Gerbino**

On March 18, 2014, while working off duty at Wal-Mart, Officer Cassell was informed of a potential fraud. The electronics department had suffered losses in excess of $100,000 and Officer Cassell began an in-depth investigation. During his investigation, Officer Cassell learned that a Wal-Mart employee was involved in selling cell phones fraudulently. During the transactions, the employee used the personal identifying information of dozens of victims to sell the cell phones to his friends. The suspects would profit by later selling these cell phones through various outlets and splitting the profits with the employee. Officer Cassell investigated this case for two weeks, culminating in the interview of the Wal-Mart employee. Once the store investigators fired the employee, Officer Cassell was prepared for the interrogation and brought Detective Gerbino. At the conclusion of their interrogation, the accomplices of the employee were set up and all three were arrested on potentially hundreds of felony charges. Officer Cassell worked quickly and efficiently to set up the sting of the accomplices and never compromised officer safety. He coordinated outside assistance with PAR and other Patrol units. Detective Gerbino responded and conducted a thorough interview, which led to a full confession and the information regarding the accomplices. Officer Cassell and Detective Gerbino worked together in an efficient and extremely effective manner. Their efforts to fully comprehend and investigate this case are an example of the highest standards of law enforcement.

**Officer Edward Acuti, Officer James Benedict, Officer Todd Chanos, Officer Andy Crowley, and Sergeant Dana Hatfield**

On February 8, 2014 at approximately 1545 hours, officers responded to 22934 East Smoky Hill Road on a hit-and-run crash where an off duty Aurora police officer was struck and injured. Sergeant Dana Hatfield researched the suspect vehicle information and contacted the owner. Sergeant Hatfield was able to obtain the likely location of the suspect due to his quick use of the computer. Officer Benedict responded to the home of the suspect, Lucas Pekas, and located the suspect vehicle in the driveway. Officers Crowley, Acuti, and Chanos responded to assist Officer Benedict.

Officer Benedict observed the suspect get out of the white Toyota 4-Runner and run into the house. Officers Benedict and Crowley followed Pekas into the residence and ordered him to stop. Officer Benedict heard the sound of a rifle bolt cycling, then saw Pekas coming up the stairs. Pekas charged the officers and a three to four minute struggle ensued. Officers Acuti and Chanos arrived and assisted with use of a taser and other arrest control techniques. Pekas was taken into custody without injury to Pekas or the officers.

Sergeant Dana Hatfield, Officer James Benedict, Officer Andy Crowley, Officer Edward Acuti and Officer Todd Chanos are to be commended for their quick action by placing this dangerous suspect into custody, while taking precautions to keep themselves safe and not injure the suspect.
Officer Chad Berger, Officer Andy Eways, Officer Jeremy Fink, Officer Tony Ortiz, Detective Dave Perry, Detective Tom Sobieski, and Crime Analyst Dawn Tollakson

On March 20, 2014, at about 1850 hours, a woman was threatened with a weapon as she was carjacked near W. 26th Ave. and Federal Blvd. in Denver. Hours later the suspect entered the 7-11 store at E. Quincy Ave. and S. Parker Rd. and threatened to kill the clerk, saying he had a gun as he robbed the store. The crime spree continued into the early morning of March 21, when the suspect again robbed a second 7-11 store at S. Gartrell Rd. and E-470. The suspect told the clerk he had a gun. District 3 Detectives Dave Perry, Tom Sobieski and Crime Analyst Dawn Tollakson began pulling data, witness statements, and store video further the investigation. The suspect struck again in Arapahoe County where he pulled into the Bradley gas station near Arapahoe Rd. and S. Peoria St. and told a woman who was pumping gas that he had a gun and to get into his car. The woman challenged the suspect, resulting in the suspect driving off and leaving the victim unharmed. On March 22, 2014, the Denver County Chief Marshal saw the suspect vehicle and called the Aurora Police Department.

Officers Chad Berger and Andy Eways observed the vehicle southbound on E-470 as it passed Smoky Hill Rd. A potentially dangerous high risk traffic stop was initiated on E-470 at Gartrell Rd. by Officers Chad Berger, Andy Eways, Jeremy Fink and Tony Ortiz. They safely and successfully arrested the male suspect without incident. The male suspect was transported to the Aurora Detention Facility where he was interrogated by District 3 detectives who were successful in gaining a full confession from the suspect regarding the violent crime spree.

Officer Barb Asmussen, Detective Michael Cahenzli, Officer Shane Ellison, Officer Darren Lantz, Officer Thomas Lord, Officer Travis Lore, Officer Jason Moore, Officer James Salazar, Officer David Sutherland, Detective Thomas Wilson, Officer Eric White, and Administrative Specialist Tina Crux

During the weekend of February 22, 2014, several businesses were burglarized in the South Aurora area. One location was the Metro Gang Task Force. Several electronic data storage devices with very sensitive information on them were taken. There was a heightened degree of attention to find these items due to the lost data. Video surveillance of the suspect was obtained. Officer Eric White recognized the suspect from an earlier burglary investigation and disseminated the information. Officer Shane Ellison located the stolen vehicle from another burglary and spotted the suspect who was then arrested. During this arrest, DART officers found the other suspect in possession of stolen items from MGTF. Critical high priority evidence was still missing. District 3 PAR and DART continued to work the area and were instrumental in identifying additional suspects. Officer Barbara Asmussen processed the crime scene. District 3 Detectives furthered the investigation and filed the case. Approximately three weeks later, one of the stolen items was sold to a second-hand store which was tracked by Mrs. Tina Crux in the Pawn Unit. Detective Cahenzli recovered the stolen items and the remaining storage device taken from MGTF.

Due to the determination, professionalism, and teamwork of Officers Ellison, White, Lord, Sutherland, Salazar, Moore, Asmussen, Lantz, Lore and Detectives Cahenzli and Wilson, along with Ms. Crux, suspects were identified and arrested, and highly sensitive evidence was recovered without any exposure or release of damaging information.
Officer Darrin Degon, Officer Gary Rivale, and Officer James Waselkow
On November 23, 2013, at approximately 0150 hours, District 3 Patrol Officers Darrin Degon and Gary Rivale responded to the area of 3173 S. Uravan Way on an unknown problem. Officer Degon aired that a vehicle had attempted to run him over and Officer Rivale aired that the vehicle had struck him. The suspect made two separate and deliberate attempts to run over Officers Degon and Rivale. He successfully struck Officer Rivale, causing a lower leg injury. Additional officers arrived in the area and located the suspect vehicle. They conducted a felony traffic stop during which the suspect made furtive movements consistent with drawing a weapon. Officer James Waselkow observed the behavior and concluded that the suspect was intending to produce a weapon. Officer Waselkow began taking up slack on his trigger in preparation to eliminate a potentially deadly threat. The suspect only partially complied with orders forcing officers to utilize physical force to arrest him. Officers diligently obtained medical attention for the suspect and for Officer Rivale. The officers did an excellent job in the investigation of the crime scenes, obtaining additional assets necessary to complete a thorough investigation.

Officer Dave Sutherland
On June 19, 2014, Detective Randy Hansen with the FBI Innocence Lost Task Force sent out a bulletin on a missing endangered juvenile who was being recruited for prostitution by a couple that was staying at the Motel 6. Detective Hansen checked the location and found that a second female had rented the room. Officer Dave Sutherland checked his email at end of watch on June 19, and he recognized the picture of the endangered juvenile as a girl he had seen earlier in the day while driving by the Crestwood Suites at approximately 2000 hours. Officer Sutherland noted the girl seen had the same hair and glasses and was standing on the sidewalk by the parking lot. Officer Sutherland notified Detective Hansen of these facts via email prior to going home. The next morning, Detective Hansen went to the Crestwood Suites in response to this email, finding the same girl from the Motel 6 registered at this location. The occupants of the room were contacted and the endangered juvenile was located along with another juvenile being prostituted at this location. Two individuals who were suspected of pimping these juveniles were arrested on felony charges.

Officer Erik Van Cleave
On December 14, 2013, Officer Erik Van Cleave was off duty and in the area of South Broadway and Dry Creek Road, when he observed several police cars from multiple agencies with emergency equipment operating. Officer Van Cleave learned there was an active shooter at nearby Arapahoe High School. Officer Van Cleave drove to the area near the high school, grabbed his active shooter bag, rifle, and an APD ID vest and ran to the police command post where he offered his assistance. Officer Van Cleave was deployed with three other officers that had just arrived and headed for the school. Once inside the school, Officer Van Cleave was briefed by on scene deputy sheriffs on the current status of the shooter and the efforts to safely evacuate the students. Deputies advised that the shooter was in the library and there were students trapped in the science pod that needed to be cleared. The officers cleared multiple rooms finding students and teachers. The science pod was completely searched and secured. Officer Van Cleave continued to provide assistance with evacuating all the students from the area. Once all the students were evacuated and placed on buses, Officer Van Cleave was relieved of his duty.
Officer Van Cleave is commended for his commitment to duty and honor. As a police officer, regardless of his off duty status, he responded to a very serious situation involving an active shooter in a high school in another city. He courageously placed himself in danger, exemplifying all Aurora police officers.

**Officer James Waselkow**

While assigned to District 3 Patrol, Officer James Waselkow attained knowledge of drug interdiction which was very beneficial in a high concentration of motels known for drug trafficking. Detective Alan Shank of the Vice and Narcotics Unit stated, "James has devoted a lot of time and effort to finding drugs within Aurora and making arrests for these crimes. James has shown great effort in educating himself on case law, statutory changes, narcotics trafficking trends, and is continually trying to improve his ability and skill in this area...On several occasions James has contacted persons who are armed, and/or been in possession of substantial amounts of drugs...James, by my estimate, is responsible for more on-view drug arrests than any other patrol officer that I am aware of."

Officer Waselkow's supervisor, Sergeant John Tollakson added, "In the time that I have been working in District 3, Watch 3, I have been on scene of multiple arrests made by Officer Waselkow. I have recently been involved in two significant cases where Officer Waselkow not only made a good investigatory stop, but he also used great restraint. In the first case, Officer Waselkow recovered a sizeable amount of methamphetamine while dealing with a wildly out of control suspect. Throughout the encounter Officer Waselkow maintained his professionalism and ultimately was forced to use soft restraints to gain control of the combative suspect. In the second case, Officer Waselkow once again exercised great restraint while arresting a suspect who was in possession of a very large amount of methamphetamine, who had a large knife by his right hand. This matter could have easily become an Officer involved shooting had it not been for the calmness, communication and coordination between Officer Waselkow and other assisting units."

Officer Waselkow strives to learn and evolve in his professional capacity as a patrol officer. His reports are typically exceptional, very well-articulated and rarely require corrections. Officer Waselkow's dedication, professionalism and investigatory skills, relative to drug trafficking and interdiction in particular, are to be commended.

**Officer Kenneth Forrest, Officer Gary Rivale, and Sergeant John Tollakson**

On November 28, 2013, at approximately 0155 hours, Officer Kenneth Forrest made a traffic stop on a suspected DUI driver traveling southbound at 3500 South Parker Road. The suspect vehicle stopped in the #1 lane at which time Officer Forrest requested a cover car to assist. Officer Gary Rivale responded and parked his marked patrol unit directly behind Officer Forrest's marked patrol unit. Sergeant Tollakson responded and proceeded to tactically park his marked patrol unit at an angle behind Officer Rivale's unit in order to create a safer working environment for the ensuing investigation. Sergeant Tollakson observed a vehicle rapidly approaching their position in the #1 traffic lane. Realizing that a collision was imminent, Sergeant Tollakson yelled loudly to Officers Forrest and Rivale to get out of the way. Officer Forrest, without hesitation or regard for his own personal safety, grabbed his DUI suspect and placed her on the other side of the nearby jersey barrier, out of harm’s way. As Sergeant Tollakson, Officer Forrest, and Officer Rivale were scrambling to avoid being injured by the imminent collision, a second DUI suspect...
slammed into the rear of Sergeant Tollakson's marked patrol car, catapulting it into traffic where it struck another motorist before coming to rest.

Sergeant Tollakson, Officer Forrest, and Officer Rivale immediately went to check on injuries of the parties involved as the vehicles in the collision. Due to their teamwork, communication and swift action, without regard for their own safety, only one individual sustained a minor injury.

**Acting Sergeant John Wilton**  
On the morning of March 27, 2014, officers from all three districts became engaged in a manhunt for an armed and dangerous parolee who had brutally beaten and sexually assaulted his ex-girlfriend. A passerby witnessed the suspect dragging the female victim and both parties were reportedly covered in blood. The suspect contacted an acquaintance via his cell phone and stated that he would not go back to prison if confronted by the police. Acting Sergeant John Wilton, accompanied by several officers, converged on the suspect after successfully pinging his cell phone and locating him in the vicinity of the 13500 Block of Fitzsimons Drive. A foot pursuit ensued and the suspect, who was still believed to be armed with a knife or a firearm, was subsequently cornered in a greenbelt in Side Creek Park. In his desperation, the suspect appeared to place a cutting instrument to his neck and threatened to harm himself. Acting Sergeant Wilton, who is a trained hostage negotiator, immediately engaged the suspect in extensive dialogue while tactically providing a safe environment for responding officers to be deployed. Acting Sergeant Wilton’s composed and professional interaction with the despondent suspect was instrumental in gaining control and perspective of the situation, which allowed officers and Aurora Fire Department personnel to effectively prepare for numerous contingencies as the suspect’s behavior fluctuated. Less lethal force was ultimately deployed resulting in the suspect being safely taken into custody without further incident.

**Officer Myshell Bolton, Officer Steven Evans, Officer Juan Gonzalez, Sergeant Mike Hawkins, and Officer Machelle Williby**  
On October 3, 2014, at approximately 2300 hours, Officers Steven Evans, Machelle Williby, Juan Gonzalez and Myshell Bolton responded to 4691 South Fraser Circle on a call of an elderly woman whose son had destroyed household objects and then fled on foot. The subject, Bret Doyle, had been diagnosed with Schizophrenic Effective Disorder with Bi-Polar tendencies. Officers attempted to locate Mr. Doyle and initiated a BOLO for the remainder of the watch.

A few hours later, Mr. Doyle returned to the location brandishing a knife and threatened to harm himself with the knife. Officers had tactically staged paramedics and deployed less lethal as well as lethal options before initiating a dialogue with Mr. Doyle. Officer Evans was lethal cover with his pistol and Officer Williby was less lethal cover with her Taser. CIT Officer Juan Gonzalez was in dialogue with Doyle and was able to get him to take the knife from his neck, place it at his stomach and sit down on the porch thereby reducing his mobility and improving the safety margin for all present. Officer Bolton ensured that neighbors remained inside their residences and then went into the subject’s residence from the rear and located the front door, preventing Mr. Doyle from going back into the residence. Officer Gonzalez did an excellent job of interacting with Mr. Doyle; however, when Mr. Doyle began making statements regarding suicide by cop, he was subdued via a Taser strike by Sergeant Hawkins. He was taken into custody, charged with disorderly conduct and placed on a mental health hold.
Through the officers’ calm demeanors, teamwork, communication and superb tactics, a potential officer involved shooting incident was safely avoided.

**Officer Patrick Youngquist**
On April 10, 2014, Officer Patrick Youngquist was dispatched to a healthcare facility on a report of a sex assault. He determined that the 15-year-old victim’s allegations involved multiple jurisdictions and incidents spanning over a period of eleven years with the alleged perpetrator being her older step brother.

Although none of the alleged incidents occurred within the city of Aurora, Officer Youngquist initiated a thorough preliminary interview, completed a detailed report, and made appropriate notifications in support of eventual investigations by other agencies having jurisdiction.

Officer Youngquist is commended for his investigative efforts which went far above and beyond what would be expected. Officer Youngquist took a victim centered approach, focusing on the needs and concerns of the victim in a nonjudgmental way that ensured a compassionate and sensitive delivery of service.

Officer Youngquist is awarded a Commander’s Commendation for performance of his duties in such a manner as to reflect high quality and professionalism on behalf of the Aurora Police Department.

**Officer Grant Heyneman and Officer Rob Pavletic**
From April 14 to May 30, 2014, Officers Grant Heyneman and Rob Pavletic were detailed to the Training Academy as instructors to assist with staffing shortages. Both Heyneman and Pavletic made adjustments to their own schedules to meet the demands of the Academy staffing needs. During this time period there was both a basic and a lateral recruit academy in session, as well as a demanding 2nd quarter in-service, EVOC, and PT. The Academy staff were impressed on how they both jumped in and naturally took to the assignment. Furthermore, countless in-service attendees commented on the clarity and professionalism of their instruction. On behalf the Training Section, thank you both for your hard work and the exemplary attitude you displayed. Both recruit and in-service training benefitted from your quality instruction, including some training that would not have been possible without your help. Your contributions in assisting the Training Academy with accomplishing its mission are extremely appreciated.
Automated Complaint and Commendation Report

The Automated Complaint and Commendation System accepts and records all submissions. The Department designed the system to manage the complaints and commendations reported on sworn personnel.

During 2014, there were 249 complaints received online or entered by a Police Department member that involved 322 sworn members and 7 non-sworn members.

Additionally, fifty-nine (59) commendations were received for sworn officers. There were zero (0) commendations submitted for non-sworn members of the Department.

2014 Automated Complaints and Commendations

- Sworn Complaints (322)
- Non-Sworn Complaints (7)
- Sworn Commendations (59)
Automated Complaints by Type

The Automated Complaint System categorizes the submissions for the Department to analyze, determine trends and provide instruction if needed.

The system categorized the complaints received during 2014, as follows: One (1) alleging an illegal search. One (1) reported neglect of duty. Three (3) reported violations of Constitutional rights. Seven (7) allegations of unsatisfactory performance. Fifteen (15) allegations of racial profiling. Twenty-four (24) reports of excessive use of force. Thirty-two (32) complaints of improper or incomplete investigations. Forty-three (43) for other directives or SOPs not captured under the other types. One-hundred-ten (110) complaints of rudeness or professionalism issues.

Complaints by Type

- Illegal Search (1)
- Neglect of Duty (1)
- Constitutional Requirements (3)
- Unstatisfactory Performance (7)
- Bias-based Profiling (15)
- Use of Force (24)
- Improper/Incomplete Investigation (32)
- Other Dept. Directive or SOP (43)
- Officer Professionalism (110)
Automated Complaints by Validity

In each of the complaint submissions received, the officer’s supervisor has investigated the complaint. The officer’s chain of command has reviewed the investigations before closing them.

The Department has reviewed each of the complaints and analyzed the validity of the complaint. From these there were Forty-four (44) sustained, forty (40) not sustained, One-hundred-thirty-three (133) unfounded, fifty-six (56) within policy, eleven (11) misunderstandings, and nineteen (19) unknown due to unresponsive complainants.

Complaints by Validity

- Sustained (44)
- Not Sustained (40)
- Unfounded (133)
- Policy Compliance (56)
- Misunderstanding (11)
- Unknown Validity (19)
Automated Complaints, Results

The Automated Complaint System records any corrective action taken by the Department as a result of the investigation. The results range from “none justified” to an order by the Chief to the Internal Affairs Section to formally investigate the complaint. Careful study and comparison of this information will reveal that more incidents result in some form of correction than incidents that we found to be valid. This is because the complaint may not be valid in light of the Department Directives, but the supervisor may determine the officer needs some degree of instruction to help him/her do a better job.

The results of the complaints submitted are as follows in descending order of severity. The Chief of Police ordered the Internal Affairs Section to formally investigate thirty-two (32) members. The Department issued seven (7) Written Reprimands for violations of Department Directives. A Written Reprimand is permanent discipline that remains in the officer’s file for his/her entire career. The Department issued ten (10) Corrective Action Reports instructing the officers to change their behavior. The Corrective Action Report is not discipline but a notice or warning to modify behavior. The Corrective Action Report remains in the officer’s file for one to two years, depending on his/her evaluation date and cycle. It is documentation of past problems and corrective measures taken if the officer repeats the behavior. The officer’s supervisors issued twenty-two (22) Performance Appraisal Entry (PAE) reports documenting negative performance. The supervisors use the PAE reports as documentation and are included in the officers’ annual evaluations. On four (4) occasions the supervisors verbally counseled the officers. Nine complaints were referred to mediation. The supervisors completed nineteen (19) Performance Appraisal Entry reports that were to document the investigation only (nothing negative toward the officer). The Department concluded in one-hundred-ninety (190) of the complaints that the complaint was not valid and that no documentation was needed.

Automated Compliants - Results

- Referred to IAS (32)
- Written Reprimand (7)
- Corrective Action Report (10)
- PAE for Correction (22)
- PAE Documentation (19)
- No Documentation Needed (190)
- Mediation (9)
- Counseling Only (4)
Automated Complaints, Follow Up Contact Method

At the conclusion of the investigation the supervisor is required, if possible, to contact the complainant and explain the findings. The Automated Complaint System records show the supervisor contacted that person.

The supervisors contacted the complainant by telephone in one hundred twenty-five (125) of the cases. The supervisors used e-mail nine (9) times. In twenty-eight (28) cases, the supervisor could not contact the complainant (anonymous complaint or attempted but unable to contact). The supervisor met the complainant in person twenty-four (24) times.
Automated Commendations by Type

The system categorized the fifty-nine (59) commendations received during 2014 as follows:

Twelve (12) citizen submissions expressed appreciation for the officer. Ten (10) others reported a job well done. Four (4) submissions stated the officer was professional. Three (3) reported the officer went above and beyond expectations and Thirty (30) expressed a thank you.

### Automated Commendations by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Well Done</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above and Beyond</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank You</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Automated Complaint and Commendation System, Miscellaneous Information on People Reporting

The automated complaint and commendation system allows the submitting person the opportunity to provide information about himself/herself. The system has a drop-down menu giving the person a choice of options to describe himself/herself. One hundred fifty-one (151) of the people submitting a complaint or commendation indicated they were a citizen of Aurora. Fifty-four (54) indicated they were a non-resident. Twenty (20) said they were an employee member of the Department, and three (3) indicated they were a government official.

Type of People Submitting Commendation and Complaints

- Resident (151)
- Non-Resident (54)
- Member (20)
- City Official (3)
Gender of People Submitting Commendations and Complaints

- Male (119)
- Female (100)
- Unknown Gender (23)

Reported Ethnicity of People Submitting Commendations and Complaints

- White (79)
- African American (41)
- Latino (19)
- Asian (7)
- American Indian (1)
- Arab (1)
- Unknown (89)
District and Bureau Discipline Report

During 2014, the Department completed and finalized twenty-five (25) District / Bureau investigations. Each resulted in the Chief of Police ordering a Written Reprimand as discipline for the violation of one or more Department Directives. A Written Reprimand is permanent discipline that remains in the employee’s file for his/her career. The following is a summary of these cases for 2014.

Chief Metz and the Aurora Police Department recognize the individual members of the Aurora Police Department have a right to privacy in the contents of their personnel files and expect the contents of these files will be held in confidence by their employer. This expectation and right to privacy flows from the United States Constitution, the Colorado Constitution, the Colorado Open Records Act, Colorado Revised Statutes § 24-72-201, et. seq., the Colorado Criminal Justice Records Act, Colorado Revised Statutes, § 24-72-301, et. seq., the City of Aurora Personnel Policies and Procedures, and the Aurora Police Department Directives. While there is little, if any, public interest in investigations stemming from allegations relating to purely administrative matters such as the use of equipment, abuse of leave and the like, these matters are nonetheless provided below.

Further, the City of Aurora also maintains the right to withhold its deliberative process as confidential. The following summaries are included below with these privileges of confidentiality in mind. The following summaries do not constitute a waiver of either the individual employee’s expectation of privacy in the contents of his/her personnel file, nor waiver of the City of Aurora’s right to withhold its deliberative process as confidential.

The Department has categorized these twenty-five (25) cases as follows: Seven (7) cases involved members not following Department policies for vehicle operations and/or the Department’s emergency response policy. Four (4) cases were for unsatisfactory performance. Four (4) cases involved issues of professional conduct. Three (3) cases involved the handling of evidence. Three (3) cases involved department equipment. One (1) case involved the negligent discharge of a weapon. One (1) case involved secondary employment. One (1) case involved the release of information.

The twenty-five (25) District/Bureau written reprimands involved twenty-six (26) members and were issued to two (2) civilians, twenty (20) officers, three (3) sergeants, and one (1) lieutenant.

These matters that resulted in written reprimands are summarized with more detail below.
1) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3.5 **Neglect of Duty**.

   At 1323 hours, two officers were dispatched to a call of a burglary in progress. The primary officer indicated he was enroute at 1324 hours, but did not leave his location until 1334 hours. The officer did not relay his location or the reason for the delay. The cover officer arrived and contacted the suspect believing the primary officer was responding and would be there very soon. The primary officer was called off at 1341 hours, still about 15 minutes from the scene.

2) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.2.8 **Authorized Use of Police Pursuits**.

   Officers attempted a traffic stop on a party wanted on misdemeanor domestic violence charges. Each officer had emergency lights activated while behind the suspect’s vehicle. The suspect abruptly stopped the vehicle, causing both officers to have to immediately stop. The suspect made evasive maneuvers, which caused his vehicle to strike the rear bumper of one of the patrol cars and quickly accelerated away. Officers briefly pursued the suspect, which violated the above directive. The policy does not allow for pursuit of a vehicle for traffic charges and/or the underlying misdemeanor domestic violence charges for which the suspect was initially sought.

3) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 5.8.18 **Accidental Discharge of a Less Lethal Weapon**.

   The officer conducted a spark test of his department issued taser. Prior to testing, he did not remove his taser cartridge resulting in the attached cartridge being discharged.

4) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.9.2 **Responsibility for Handling or Depositing Evidence and Other Property**.

   The officer investigated a criminal offense involving two people who were found to be in possession of suspected marijuana. During the investigation, the officer recovered a small bag containing a “green leafy substance”. When the officer was done with the two people, she walked back to her assigned vehicle. Once at the vehicle she realized she was no longer in possession of the evidence. The officer attempted to locate the evidence but was unsuccessful.

5) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.3.1 **Unsatisfactory Performance** and 14.3.5 **Neglect of Duty**.

   The officer missed an “on-call” call for an auto-pedestrian crash. He did not answer the 3 phone calls or two texts. This is the officer’s second time missing an “on-call” telephone call.
6) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.1.3 Vehicle Operations.

The sergeant was on routine patrol, driving a marked patrol vehicle, when he drifted into a turn lane and struck a curb. He was traveling approximately 35-40 MPH at impact. The front tire blew out and the rim bent, as a result of the impact. The sergeant offered no explanation as to why he was not aware he drifted into the other lane.

7) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3.8 Police – Community Relations.

The officer, and his recruit officer in training, responded to the Anschutz Emergency Room to take a report of an assault. The officers had contacted the reporting party earlier that day during a family dispute and minor physical altercation. No charges were filed for the dispute and the parties separated. Before leaving the area, the reporting party yelled obscenities at the officer and the recruit. After making contact with the reporting party at the hospital, she called to complain that the officer had cursed at her and gave her the middle finger. The nurse on duty was able to confirm this did happen. The officer admitted to this behavior and also admitted to being frustrated and being under some stress while training the recruit.

8) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.9.2 Responsibility for Handling or Depositing Evidence and Other Property.

The officer conducted a traffic stop and located an illegal gun. The suspect was arrested and driven to jail when the officer realized the suspect’s wallet and cell phone were left on the trunk of the patrol car. The cell phone was located in the roadway but was destroyed. The wallet was not located.

9) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.6.5 Use of Departmental Equipment.

The officer misplaced his wallet, which contained several personal items and his Police Department issued identification card. The officer was unable to locate the wallet.

10) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.12 Secondary and Additional Employment.

The officer worked an off-duty job without prior authorization and also did not have a current work permit submitted to the Secondary Employment office.
11) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 8.2 Leave Procedures and 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility.

The officer went into leave without pay status without prior approval from the Chief’s office.

12) The Department sustained a civilian member for violating Department Directives 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility and 14.3.2 Conduct Towards Superior and Subordinate Officers and Associates.

The member received complaints regarding her training style. The member was counseled on the subject and was told to be professional and respectful in her demeanor. The complaints continued leading to further discipline.

13) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.9 Processing, Storage and Disposition of Evidence and other Property.

During an investigation the officer found a student in possession of suspected marijuana. The officer placed the evidence bag containing the confiscated suspected marijuana on a scale in the property room located at the Police Department Headquarters. The officer neglected to properly submit the suspected marijuana into Property and left the item on the scale. The items were located later by another sworn officer and placed into Property.

14) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.6.5 Use of Departmental Equipment.

The sergeant misplaced her building pass and ID card. After searching recent places visited and her home, she was unable to locate them.

15) The Department sustained a civilian member for violating Department Directive 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility.

The Crime Scene Investigator made a statement while testifying in court that made the jurors gasp in disbelief. It also appeared she was inconvenienced or upset by the process.

16) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.1.3 Vehicle Operation.

The officer was responding to a suspicious party call without emergency equipment. As the officer was traveling toward an intersection, he observed the light was green. The officer looked down briefly at the MDC notes reference the call. The officer didn’t notice the vehicle directly in front of him had stopped when the light turned yellow. As a result, the officer collided into the rear of that vehicle causing minor damage to both vehicles.
17) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.6 Public Information.

The Lieutenant spoke to a reporter on two occasions and released information about a shooting.

18) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.2.3 Requirements and Restrictions of Emergency Responses.

The officer was responding to assist other officers involved in a physical struggle with a combative party at a bar. Another vehicle veered into the officer’s lane of travel. The officer took evasive action to avoid a collision and in doing so, lost control when he veered back into the lane, causing the patrol car to slide and rotate into on-coming lanes of traffic, going over a curb, and colliding with a brick wall. The patrol car and wall were damaged. It was determined the officer was traveling approximately 80 MPH in a posted 35 MPH zone.

19) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.2.2 Adherence to Law During Emergency Response.

The officer was responding to a roll-over accident with his emergency lights and siren activated. The officer attempted to make a U-turn in front of another vehicle, causing a collision. The administrative accident review determined the accident could have been prevented.

20) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance.

The recruit received 4 failing grades on the geography portion of the Police Academy testing.

21) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.1.6 Conformance to Directives and 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance.

The Sergeant was the custodian of the Property Unit at the time the Unit became involved in the destruction of evidence in several cases. It was this Sergeant’s responsibility to ensure that all section Standard Operating Procedures are followed by all the members of the unit. His lapse in supervision caused the department embarrassment and hours of investigation in order to right the wrongs caused by the destruction of DNA evidence.

22) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.2.6 Police Vehicle Pursuits.

The officer made a traffic stop and determined the driver was possibly intoxicated. A DUI officer responded to the stop and asked the driver to step out of the vehicle. The driver, instead drove away in an obvious attempt to flee. The original officer got in his car, activated the patrol car’s
emergency lights and siren and pursued the car to the driver’s house where the driver tried to park the car in the garage and close the door. The pursuit was not justified by Department Directives standards.

23) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.6.5 Use of Departmental Equipment.

The officer lost his wallet, which contained his police building pass, police ID, and his undercover driver’s license. The wallet was recovered in the road by another City employee. The police ID was recovered but the building pass and undercover driver’s license was still missing.

24) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.2.2 Adherence to Law During Emergency Response.

The officer was responding emergent in his unmarked low-profile vehicle to a report of an armed party. The officer did not have the siren activated. The officer came to an intersection and slowed while looking for traffic. A vehicle traveling the other direction collided with the unmarked unit, causing minor damage. The review process deemed this accident as preventable. Also, this was the officer’s second accident in two years.

25) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance.

The officer was on duty with her K-9 partner when they responded to assist other officers who were attempting to apprehend a shoplifting suspect who was fleeing on foot. The officer got out of the patrol car, leaving the car door open and the K-9 exited the vehicle through the open partition and engaged the suspect, biting him on the buttocks area, causing minor injuries.
Formal Internal Investigations and Discipline Report

During 2014, the Department completed and finalized twenty-five (25) formal internal investigations. The following is a summary of the cases resolved in 2014.

Chief Metz and the Aurora Police Department recognize the individual members of the Aurora Police Department have a right to privacy in the contents of their personnel files, including the results of formal investigations and incidents of discipline, and expect the contents of these files will be held in confidence by their employer. This expectation and right to privacy flows from the United States Constitution, the Colorado Constitution, the Colorado Open Records Act, Colorado Revised Statute, § 24-72-201, et. Seq., the Colorado Criminal Justice Records Act, Colorado Revised Statutes § 24-72-301. et. Seq., the City of Aurora Personnel Policies and Procedures, and the Aurora Police Department Directives.

Further, the City of Aurora also maintains the right to withhold its deliberative process as confidential. The following summaries are included below with these privileges of confidentiality in mind. The inclusion of the following summaries does not constitute a waiver of either the individual employee’s expectation of privacy in the contents of his/her personnel files, nor waiver of the City of Aurora’s right to withhold its deliberative process as confidential. In an effort to balance the privacy and confidentiality rights of the individual officers, retaining the deliberative process privilege associated with the decision making detailed below, while at the same time providing our citizens with sufficient information to evaluate the adequacy, thoroughness and impartiality of the Aurora Police Department’s internal investigation and disciplinary process, the following information is provided:

Summary

The Department conducted and resolved twenty-five (25) formal Internal Affairs investigations in 2014 involving forty (40) department members. These members consisted of one (1) civilian, thirty-one (31) officers, one (1) agent, and seven (7) sergeants. The discipline included thirteen (13) suspensions without pay, and nine (9) written reprimands. Two (2) members resigned or retired before discipline was issued. The Department cleared fourteen (14) members of any wrongdoing; either by findings of compliance, exoneration, or they were not sustained. Two (2) investigations were ended before completion when the Chief concluded that was a more appropriate disposition of the cases.
1) The Department investigated two sworn members involved in a shooting. This is standard practice in any officer-involved shooting. Directives reviewed for compliance were Directives 5.1.2 Authorized Use of Deadly or Potentially Deadly Force, 5.5.15 Ammunition, 5.5.16 Weapon Inspection and Registration, 7.3.2 Firearms Qualification, 7.3.4 Semi-Automatic Weapons Training, and 14.5.5 Applicability and Basis for Conducting Tests. The officers were found to be in compliance with these Directives. Further investigation involved the review of Directives 5.1.3 Justification for the Use of Deadly or Potentially Deadly Force and 5.1.6 Shooting at or From a Moving Vehicle. One officer was sustained for both and the other officer was exonerated on 5.1.3 but sustained on 5.1.6. The first officer was suspended without pay for 320 hours and required to attend 24 hours of specialized training. The second officer received a written reprimand. The first officer appealed the discipline to the Civil Service Commission. Although the Civil Service found the officer was not sustained on Directive 5.1.3, they affirmed the discipline.

Officers responded to a report of larceny from vehicles in progress at a vehicle storage lot. The officers approached the suspects on foot then addressed the suspects by giving them verbal commands. The suspects ignored the commands and got into their vehicle and the driver accelerated in the officer’s direction. Fearing they were going to be struck by the vehicle, both officers discharged their duty weapons, striking the driver and rear passenger. The driver was killed and the rear passenger received severe injuries but did survive.

2) The Department investigated a sworn member for possibly violating Department Directives 14.1.5 Conformance to Law, 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility and City of Aurora Policy 4-2 (C)(4) Disciplinary Action – Just Cause. The Member was sustained for violating 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility and City of Aurora Policy 4-2 (C)(4) Disciplinary Action – Just Cause. The member was suspended for 100 hours and was ordered to attend training.

The sergeant was arrested for Domestic Violence.

3) Department investigated three sworn members involved in a shooting. This is standard practice in any officer-involved shooting. Directives that were included in the investigation were 5.1.2 Authorized Use of Deadly or Potentially Deadly Force, 5.5.5 Rifle Specifications, 5.5.15 Ammunition, 5.5.16 Weapon Inspection and Qualification, 7.3.2 Firearms Qualification, 7.3.4 Semi-Automatic Weapons Training, 7.3.5 Automatic-Semi-Automatic Rifle Training, 14.5.8 Critical Incident Drug/Alcohol Testing. One officer was sustained on 5.5.5 Rifle Specifications and 7.3.5 Automatic-Semi-Automatic Rifle Training. This officer received a written reprimand.

Officers responded to a SWAT call in which a suspect had barricaded himself inside the residence after killing three people. A fourth person was able to escape and told police that he would shoot them if he saw them. There was an extended standoff in which the suspect shot at vehicles and officers. Officers returned fire and fatally wounded the suspect, ending the standoff. During the review of shooting, it was discovered that one of the officers had not properly loaded two rifle
magnets and was unable to locate his rifle qualification card. The officer involved shooting was deemed justified by the District Attorney’s Office.

4) The Department investigated a sworn member for possible violations of Department Directives 4.3.8 Traffic Accidents, 8.10.11 Traffic Accident Reports, 14.1.5 Conformance to Law, 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility, 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance, 14.3.3 Making a False or Untruthful Declaration, and 14.3.10 Reporting Responsibility. The member tendered his resignation before discipline was ordered.

The officer was dispatched to a traffic accident with injury. When he arrived, he found two people had been injured and there was damage to one vehicle. The officer did not conduct a thorough investigation, did not take a report or issue a summons to the at-fault driver.

5) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.1.3 Vehicle Operation. The member received a Written Reprimand.

The officer was driving, approaching an intersection. He was looking at the MDC in his car as he approached the intersection. When he looked up from his computer, he noticed that the light for westbound traffic had turned yellow. Thinking the light had just turned yellow, and that he had enough time, he continued through the intersection. Prior to him crossing into the intersection, the light turned red. He was captured on the photo red light cameras as he passed into the intersection on a red light. This was his third photo red light violation in a two year period.

6) The Department investigated two sworn members for possible directive violations. An officer was investigated for violating Directive 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility and 14.3.2 Conduct Towards Superior and Subordinate Officers and Associates. The officer was not sustained on both Directives. A sergeant was investigated, and sustained, for violating Directive 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility. The sergeant received a Written Reprimand.

It was learned the sergeant, a first line supervisor, spoke with several patrol members during a briefing in which they were voicing concerns pertaining to another officer. The sergeant allowed the individuals to voice their opinions and concerns. Immediately after this briefing, the sergeant continued a conversation with an officer who voiced concerns that she was still upset with the demeanor and past issues involving this other officer. The sergeant made a comment that the other employee she was concerned about also made a statement in the past about another female officer. The conversation was wholly inappropriate and reflected poorly on the sergeant and on other members of the department.

7) The Department sustained a civilian member for violating Department Directives 14.1.5 Conformance to Law, 14.1.7 Conduct Involving Moral Turpitude, and 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility. The member received 40-hours suspension.
The civilian member was the subject of a traffic stop in Denver while driving her personal vehicle. It was discovered she was driving with expired license plates and had no proof of insurance. The member received a summons for the violations. The member failed to appear to court for the summons and a warrant was issued. The member was the subject of a traffic stop five months later in Aurora. The license plate appeared to have been altered and was still expired, and her driver’s license was canceled/denied.

8) The Department investigated four officers for an allegation of excessive force. Three officers were investigated for possibly violating Department Directive 5.3 Use of Physical Force. All three were exonerated. The fourth officer was investigated for possibly violating Department Directives 5.3 Use of Physical Force and 6.5.8 Conduct During Transport. The officer was not sustained on 5.3 and was sustained on 6.5.8. The officer received a written reprimand.

A traffic stop was conducted by several officers and the driver was subsequently arrested for DUI. After she was cuffed, she was placed in the front passenger seat of an un-caged marked vehicle. The arrestee was left alone and she escaped from the vehicle. As she ran away from the scene, she fell to the ground. Her hands were still in the cuffs so the fall caused her minor injuries.

9) The Department investigated a sworn member involved in a shooting. This is standard practice in any officer-involved shooting. Directives reviewed for compliance were Directives 5.1.2 Authorized Use of Deadly or Potentially Deadly Force, 5.5.15 Ammunition, 5.5.16 Weapon Inspection and Registration, 7.3.2 Firearms Qualification, 7.3.4 Semi-Automatic Weapons Training, and 14.5.5 Applicability and Basis for Conducting Tests. The officer was found to be in compliance with all of the above Directives. Included in the review was Directive 5.1.6 Shooting at or From a Moving Vehicle. The officer was not sustained.

Officers were dispatched to a theft in progress. The call notes indicated the suspect fled the area. Officers conducted a traffic stop on the subject’s vehicle. The suspect ignored orders to turn off his vehicle and made a motion toward the center console, shifting the car in gear. The officer told the suspect to “stop” but the vehicle moved rapidly, causing the door to hit the officer, jostling forward and backward. The officer fired his weapon when struck by the door. The force from the moving vehicle knocked the officer backwards, causing him to fall to the ground and strike his head on the street. The suspect fled the area but was apprehended a short time later. It was found at that time that the suspect sustained a non-fatal gunshot wound to the leg.

10) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 4.2.2 Adherence to Law During Emergency Responses and 4.2.3 Requirements and Restrictions of Emergency Responses. The member received 20-hours suspension.

The officer was responding to an armed robbery. Other officers called over the radio that they were following a vehicle matching the description of the suspect vehicle. The officer activated his lights and siren, to assist the other officers in stopping the suspect vehicle. The officer entered an
intersection while the lights for his direction were red. The officer collided with another vehicle. The data from the vehicle showed the officer was traveling 98 MPH 2.5 seconds prior to entering the intersection. The estimated speed at the time of collision was between 50 and 55 MPH.

11) The Department investigated a sworn member involved in a shooting. This is standard practice in any officer-involved shooting. Directives reviewed for compliance were 5.1.2 Authorized Use of Deadly or Potentially Deadly Force, 5.5.5 Rifle Specifications, 5.5.15 Ammunition, 5.5.16 Weapon Inspection and Registration, 7.3.2 Firearms Qualification, 7.3.4 Semi-Automatic Weapons Training, 7.3.5 Automatic/Semi-Automatic Rifle Training, and 14.5.8 Critical Incident Drug/Alcohol Testing. One of the officers was non-compliant/sustained for Directives 7.3.2 and 14.5.8 and received a Written Reprimand.

Officer responded to a call of an armed party involving an altercation between a man and a woman. The suspect male left the scene in a vehicle while reportedly armed. Officers located the vehicle and pulled the suspect over and a stand-off ensued. The suspect repeatedly brandished a shortened shotgun, at times even putting it in his own mouth. The suspect did not comply with the officers’ orders so when he pointed the shotgun in the direction of the officers, they fired striking him once in the knee, ending the stand-off. During the review of shooting, it was discovered that one of the officers had not properly notified and filed a prescription form as required and no a record of 3rd Quarter qualification could be found. The officer involved shooting was deemed justified by the District Attorney’s Office.

12) The Department initiated an internal investigation for possible violation of 2.8.7 Fitness for Duty. The investigation was closed per the direction of the Chief’s office after the proper paperwork was received from the officer’s doctors, releasing the officer back to full duty.

13) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.1.5 Conformance to Law. The member received a 160-hour suspension.

The Agent was arrested for DUI.

14) The Department investigated an officer for violating Department Directives 6.1.3 Release of Juveniles Arrested Without a Warrant, 6.5.2 Handcuffing Detainees, 6.7 Prisoner Escapes, 11.2.8 Guidelines to be Followed when Referring Juveniles to Legal Proceedings and Taking Them into Temporary Custody, and 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility. The officer’s sergeant was also investigated and sustained on violating 1.4.11 Supervisor Responsibility: Accountability for Performance of Subordinates and 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance. The officer and sergeant each received a written reprimand.

The officer assisted school security on the contact of a student who was found to be in possession of a handgun. The student was arrested and detained at the school. A second suspect was identified and arrested and was also detained at the school. The officer contacted his sergeant,
requesting additional officers to assist but was told there were none available. School security guards were assigned to watch the two prisoners. One of the suspects was un-cuffed to write a statement. After approximately 5 hours of being detained in the school office, one of the suspects escaped. The suspect was arrested the next day by the FAST Unit.

15) The Department initiated an internal investigation for possible violation of 2.8.7 Fitness for Duty. The investigation was stopped per the direction of the Chief’s office after the proper paperwork was received, releasing the sergeant back to full duty.

16) The Department initiated an internal investigation of a sworn member for possible violations of Department Directive 2.8.7 Fitness for Duty and City of Aurora Policy 3-27 Medical Leave. The member retired before the investigation was concluded.

17) The Department started investigating a sworn member for possible violations of Department Directive 2.8.7 Fitness for Duty and Aurora Policy 3-27 Employee Medical Leave. The officer retired medically so the investigation was stopped.

18) The Department initiated an internal investigation of 2 Officer and 2 Sergeants for the possible violation of directives 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility, 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance, 6.11.2 Responsibility for Preliminary Investigations, and 1.4.11 Supervisor Responsibility: Accountability for Performance of Subordinates. One Officer and both Sergeants were sustained on 1 or more of the Directives listed above. The officer received a Written Reprimand. The two Sergeants each received a 10-hour suspension.

Two sergeants and two officers responded to a reported physical and verbal altercation. Once on scene the sergeants and officers learned that four people were involved included two off-duty Denver Police officers. The investigation revealed all four of the parties had been drinking, a fight ensued, one of the DPD officers threatened the other with a handgun, and one of the parties left on foot while the other drove home. One drove back to the scene after APD personnel were on scene. An APD member drove the subject home where they discovered two young children sleeping and that they had been left home alone. It was decided no charges would be filed at the time of the initial investigation.

19) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 5.1.7 Other Unauthorized Firing of a Weapon Situations. The member received a 20-hour suspension.

The sergeant was at the APD Range qualifying with his pistol. After the qualification he went to the shed to clean the pistol and needed to dry-fire the weapon to do so. He pointed the gun in a safe direction towards the back of the cleaning bench and pulled the trigger and the gun discharged one time. The officer had removed the magazine but did not clear the chamber.
20) The Department investigated a sworn member involved in a shooting. This is standard practice in any officer-involved shooting. Directives reviewed for compliance were 5.1.2 Authorized Use of Deadly or Potentially Deadly Force, 5.5.15 Ammunition, 5.5.16 Weapon Inspection and Registration, 5.5.5 Rifle Specifications, 7.3.2 Firearms Qualification, 7.3.5 Automatic/Semi-Automatic Rifle Training, and 14.5.8 Critical Incident Drug/Alcohol Testing. The officer was found to be in compliance with all directives.

On June 6, 2014, Officers responded to a report of an intoxicated, armed suicidal person. During a standoff with officers the subject pointed a rifle at APD officers. An officer fired one round fatally wounding the subjecting and ending the standoff.

21) The Department investigated a sworn member for possible violations of Department Directives 6.11.2 Responsibility for Preliminary Investigations, 8.10.3 General Offense Reports, and 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance. The member was sustained on all directives and received a 20-hour suspension.

An officer was dispatched to a call of a teacher that had been assaulted at an Elementary school by a special needs student. During the encounter the teacher had fallen and lost consciousness. The teacher was transported to the hospital. After learning the status of the suspect child and speaking with the school staff, the officer decided to have the school administration handle the complaint. The officer did not complete an Offense Report and only made CAD note entries on the call. The officer’s sergeant learned of the incident and the lack of a report, and ordered the officer back to the school to complete the preliminary investigation and Offense Report.

22) The Department investigated a sworn member involved in a shooting. This is standard practice in any officer-involved shooting. Directives reviewed for compliance were Directives 5.1.2 Authorized Use of Deadly or Potentially Deadly Force, 5.5.15 Ammunition, 5.5.16 Weapon Inspection and Registration, 7.3.2 Firearms Qualification, 7.3.4 Semi-Automatic Weapons Training, and 14.5.8 Critical Incident Drug/Alcohol Testing. The officer was found to be in compliance with all directives listed.

Officers responded to a report of a suspicious occurrence. The officer’s met the reporting party at his apartment where he lived alone. The apartment was locked from the inside, preventing his entry. The officer kicked the door in, which was almost immediately pushed back by someone inside. Officers pushed the door open again and they saw a person standing inside just a few feet from the threshold holding an object in her hand about shoulder height. The officer ordered the subject to “drop it” and the subject did not comply. The officer fired one round toward the subject but did not strike the suspect. The subject was taken into custody without further incident.
23) The Department investigated two sworn members for violating Department Directives 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility, 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance, and 8.9.2 Responsibility for Handling or Depositing Evidence and Other Property. Each officer received a 10-hour suspension.

The two officers were on a missing person call. Upon arrival they contacted the reported missing person and his mother. The mother complained the officers were unprofessional in their contact, made unprofessional statements, and gave wrong information as to lawful procedures. Officers recovered a small amount of suspected marijuana from the juveniles pocket and discarded it on the ground, stating he could not charge the juvenile with a crime. The mother wanted her son arrested but officers did not arrest him.

24) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 5.1.7 Other Unauthorized Firing of Weapon Situations. The member received a 10-hour suspension.

An officer was checking his patrol equipment at the beginning of his shift when he accidentally discharged a department shotgun. There were no injuries and no property damage.

25) The Department investigated a sworn member for possible violations of Department Directive 14.3.3 Making a False or Untruthful Declaration and Standard Operating Procedure PAT 4.2.10 Cleanliness. The member was sustained on the SOP and received a 10-hour suspension.

An officer checked out a marked patrol unit at the start of his shift and found what appeared to be vomit inside the vehicle. The mess was reported to a supervisor and a preliminary investigation was conducted. The last officer who occupied the vehicle offered an explanation for the mess, that it could have been from a bottle of food he discarded out the passenger window but missed and it fell to the floor causing the contents to spill out.
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Introduction

In conjunction with our core values of integrity, honor and duty, the Aurora Police Department strives for professionalism in the performance of our duties. We encourage positive behavior in our employees by use of awards and commendations. We also encourage our employees and citizens to report any perceived misconduct by our officers. We investigate every complaint and concern reported to the Department and take appropriate action, protecting the rights of the citizen and the Department member. This report reflects our commitment to openness and transparency to the people we serve.

The Department has two systems to award outstanding performance and three systems to manage complaints and discipline. The two award systems are Formal Department Awards and Informal Commanders’ Commendations. The three systems used to manage complaints and disciplines are: the Automated Complaint and Commendation System; District / Bureau Discipline; and Formal Internal Investigations and Discipline.

Formal Department Awards

All employees of the Department who become aware of outstanding performance are encouraged to nominate employees and citizens for recognition through the Formal Department Awards program. Department Directive 10.7 describes the guidelines for these awards. See the Directive at the end of this report under the “Department Directives Cited in this Report” section. The Awards Board reviews and investigates all nominations for formal awards and then makes a recommendation to the Chief of Police. The Chief of Police makes the final decision on the appropriateness of each award. Awards available under the Formal Department Awards program are: Medal of Honor; Distinguished Service Cross; Purple Heart; Life Saving Award; Meritorious Service Ribbon; Chief’s Commendation Certificate; Chief’s Unit Citation; Community Commitment Certificate; and the Certificate of Appreciation – Citizen’s Award. These awards are described in the Formal Department Awards section of this report.

Informal Commander’s Commendations

Any Command Level Officer may, without a nomination to the Awards Board, award a Commander’s Commendation Certificate. The Informal Commander’s Commendations section of this report describes the certificate.

Automated Complaint and Commendation System

The Aurora Police Department created the Automated Complaint and Commendation System in 2006 to manage the investigations of and record all complaints and commendations received on sworn officers of the Department. Regardless of how received, all complaints and commendations are entered into the automated system.

Citizens can enter their complaint or commendation directly online through the City’s website. If the Department receives a complaint or commendation in person, on the telephone or in writing, the receiving employee enters the information into the system. Once entered in the automated system, the complaint or commendation remains open until closed by the officer’s Division Chief.
The system directs the complaint or commendation to the officer’s immediate supervisor for an investigation. The supervisor reports his/her finding to his/her supervisor, who approves or disapproves the investigation. That process continues until the officer’s Division Chief ultimately reviews all decisions in the chain of command and approves the investigation and resulting actions. (The policy for handling automated complaints in place for 2015 and has since been changed for 2016.)

Safeguards built into the system include the following: no one can delete the complaint or commendation. Only one supervisor can work on the complaint at a time (following the chain of command). Supervisors can add information but cannot remove it. All information inserted into the system is saved, documenting the date and time submitted and by whom. Supervisors can search the system to determine if the officer has like complaints and or commendations.

The system records all of the information and produces statistical information. Police managers use the information to determine future training needs as well as to decide an appropriate level of discipline

**District and Bureau Discipline**

The most severe result of incidents reported in this section are Written Reprimands, which are the lowest level of formal discipline. The Internal Affairs Section investigates cases that may require discipline greater than a Written Reprimand. Cases that result in corrective measures (training verses discipline) are recorded in the Automated Complaint and Commendation System. A Police Department Supervisor or Manager investigates all District / Bureau Discipline cases. He/she obtains all of the necessary information and reports his/her findings to his/her supervisor. The employee’s chain of command reviews the investigation. If any supervisor in the chain of command determines that the employee violated a Department Directive(s) and decides the appropriate level of discipline is a Written Reprimand, he/she makes that recommendation to the Chief of Police. If the Chief concurs with the findings, a Written Reprimand is prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Chief. The Chief of Police may personally issue and serve the Written Reprimand on the employee or delegate this duty to a command officer within the employee’s chain of command. The Written Reprimand is part of the employee’s permanent discipline file.

**Formal Internal Investigations and Discipline**

The Chief of Police orders all formal internal investigations. As a general rule, the Chief orders formal investigations on allegations that could potentially result in discipline that is greater than a Written Reprimand. Additionally, critical incidents (i.e. police shootings, use of force resulting in serious injuries or death, serious traffic accidents involving officers, etc.) may result in the Chief ordering a formal investigation regardless of whether there is any evidence or accusation of misconduct. The Chief’s order will allege a violation(s) of Department Directive(s). The Internal Affairs Section completes the investigation and reports its findings to the accused officer’s Division Chief. The officer’s Division Chief decides whether the evidence proves the alleged violation(s). If so, the Division Chief will sustain the allegation(s). When the Division Chief sustains an allegation, the Chief of Police orders discipline in accordance with the City’s and Department’s policies.
Perspective Statistics
The Department provides the following statistical information for the purpose of perspective. The Department currently employs 691 sworn officers and 124 civilian employees (total 815). During 2015, the Department handled 210,497 calls for service from the public, arrested 10,975 suspects, issued 6,252 criminal summonses (non-custodial arrests) and issued 47,372 traffic citations.

Formal Department Awards
During 2015, the Aurora Police Department presented 192 awards through the formal program. The Department did not present a Medal of Honor award. The Department honored seventeen (17) officers with the Distinguished Service Cross. The Department presented two (2) Purple Heart Awards. The Department presented twenty (20) officers with the Life Saving Award. The Department recognized twenty-two (22) officers with the Meritorious Service Ribbon. The Chief commended ninety-six (103) officers with Chief’s Commendation Certificates. The Chief presented nine (9) Chief’s Unit Citations. The Department presented twelve (19) citizens with the Certificate of Appreciation - Citizens Award.
**Medal of Honor**

The Medal of Honor may be awarded by the Chief of Police to members who distinguish themselves by intentionally and knowingly placing themselves in a situation that involves an actual and imminent danger of death and whose actions demonstrate conspicuous bravery or heroism significantly above and beyond the call of duty. The member must perform an act so outstanding that it clearly demonstrates extraordinary courage beyond the requirements of the Distinguished Service Cross. The member must have been aware of the great personal danger to himself/herself prior to the performance of the act and the act must have involved an imminent, actual and substantial threat to the member’s life. This award will be a medal, pin and a certificate presented by the Chief of Police.

The department did not present a **Medal of Honor** award in 2015.
The Distinguished Service Cross may be awarded by the Chief of Police to members who distinguish themselves by demonstrating exceptional bravery despite an imminent risk of serious bodily injury or death. A member may be aware or unaware of great personal peril to himself/herself prior to the performance of the act. This award will be a medal, pin and a certificate presented by the Chief of Police.

The department presented seventeen (17) **Distinguished Service Cross** awards in 2015.

**Lieutenant Jad Lanigan**

On December 3, 2014, Lieutenant Lanigan was on his way to work when he observed an auto accident on E470 and E. Quincy Ave. Lieutenant Lanigan noted the car was in the ditch and it appeared to have rolled several times. Lieutenant Lanigan ran down the embankment and approached the car. He was able to see the driver was pinned in the driver’s seat and was unconscious. The rear of the car and part of the driver’s side of the car were fully engulfed in flames. The flames were approximately 4 feet high. Lieutenant Lanigan tried to open the car doors, but they would not open due to the accident. Lieutenant Lanigan crawled into the car through the front passenger side window. He was able to grab the driver of the car and pull him out. Lieutenant Lanigan, along with two civilians, were able to move the driver out of the car to a place of safety. The driver’s jacket was burned onto his shirt, but the driver was not burned due to Lieutenant Lanigan’s quick actions.

For demonstrating exceptional bravery despite facing imminent risk of serious bodily injury or death, Lieutenant Jad Lanigan is commended for his actions and is hereby awarded the Aurora Police Department’s Distinguished Service Cross.
**Officer William Woods**

On June 3, 2015 Officer John Reiter was at the Walmart at 9400 E. Hampden Ave. when he aired that a shoplift suspect ran from him and attempted to run him over. The suspect was believed to be armed with a handgun. Officer Bill Woods heard this over the radio and headed to help locate the suspect. At 1417 hours an alarm came into dispatch at 4219 S. Alton St. where is was confirmed that suspect broke into the house. Information obtained from the resident was that her vehicle was in the garage and the keys were in it. Officer Woods showed great bravery when he placed two blocking vehicles in front of the residence’s garage to contain the suspect, prevent escape, and mitigate the threat to the surrounding community. The suspect fired one shot from a handgun through the garage at Officer Woods when the police SUV was positioned against the garage door. Officer Woods was exposed to a known risk when performing this task.

For demonstrating exceptional professionalism and bravery Officer William Woods is commended for his actions and is hereby awarded the Aurora Police Department’s Distinguished Service Cross.

**Officer Specialist Lonnie Crump, Officer Ryan Bergstrom, Officer Keith Burke, Officer Richard Day, Officer Matthew Wells-Longshore, and Officer Matthew Wyche**

On November 14, 2015 at about 11:15 a.m., a woman entered the Family Dollar store at 9131 E. Colfax Avenue and passed a note to a clerk at the store stating that people would get hurt if they did not follow the instructions in the note or if the police were called. The woman produced two knives, locked the front door and ordered customers, including children and staff to a back office. A customer called 911 and Officers Richard Ray, Officer Keith Burke, Officer Lonnie Crump, Officer Matthew Wyche, Officer Bryan Bergstrom, and Officer Matthew Wells-Longshore responded. Officer Burke attempted to break the front door glass, distracting the suspect which allowed the store manager to jump the front counter and unlock the door. The officers made immediate entry into the store, confronting the knife wielding suspect, who made a dash toward the back office where the hostages were being held. Officer Crump flanked the woman and deployed his taser, safely subduing her and ending the incident. None of the hostages were harmed.

For demonstrating exceptional professionalism and bravery, Officer Specialist Lonnie Crump, Officer Bryan Bergstrom, Officer Keith Burke, Officer Richard Ray, Officer Matthew Wells-Longshore and Officer Matthew Wyche are commended for their actions and are hereby awarded the Aurora Police Department’s Distinguished Service Cross.

**Sergeant Mike Holm, Officer Daniel Iovine, and Officer Paul Seiwald**

On April 22, 2015 officers responded to 16250 E. 40th Ave. on a report of a possible hostage situation in a room on the 6th floor. The first arriving officers learned that a housekeeper was being held by a male who was on drugs. Realizing the potential harm to the employee officers established an emergency arrest team and began to develop a rescue plan. Officer Mel Cobb set himself up in an adjoining room where he could attempt to listen to conversations and attempt contact with the male and victim. Officer Dan Iovine arrived shortly after and took position as the officer in charge of the rescue team. As more officers arrived the rescue team was adjusted to have Sergeant Barry Cape and Officer Mike Eli as breachers with Officer Iovine and Officer Seiwald as first to enter the room followed by Sergeant Mike Holm. Due to the construction of the door, when breached, only the lower half broke off causing the
initial officers to crawl through a hole in the door to make entry into the room. The male had choked the victim and was dragging her around the room threatening to throw her out a broken window. Members were given the order to execute the rescue. Officer Iovine and Officer Seiwald entered the room first and contacted the male who was in the process of assaulting the female, all four ended up on the floor where a violent fight ensued. Sergeant Holm was able to get the victim away from the suspect and pass her off to Officer Eli who safely removed her from the room. Sergeant Carlson and Officer Tim Jeffrey tased the male. When that did not stop him from fighting Officer Seiwald utilized the carotid control hold, at which time officers were able to handcuff the male and eventually place him in a hobble. Due to the quick actions of all officers involved and the rescue plan set up the hostage was rescued safely and the suspect arrested.

For demonstrating exceptional bravery despite facing imminent risk of serious bodily injury or death, Sergeant Michael Holm, Officer Daniel Iovine and Officer Paul Seiwald are commended for their actions and are hereby awarded the Aurora Police Department’s Distinguished Service Cross.

**Officer Dale Leonard**

On November 14th, 2014 at around 9 p.m., Officer Ryan Burns and Officer Dale Leonard were riding as a two officer unit performing routine patrol duties. They initiated a traffic stop on a suspicious vehicle that unknown to them had just been stolen from E. 17th Ave. and Fulton St. Upon approaching the vehicle the driver of the car fired several shots at Officer Burns with a handgun. Officer Burns was struck in the right leg above the knee, inflicting severe life threatening injuries. Officer Leonard immediately returned fire in defense of Officer Burns and himself as the vehicle sped away. Officer Leonard observed that Officer Burns was severely wounded and was losing a significant amount of blood. Officer Leonard immediately applied a tourniquet to Officer Burns’ leg to stop the bleeding. Officer Joseph Cornell arrived on scene and made the life saving decision to load Officer Burns into his patrol car and transport him to the ER at University Hospital rather than wait for rescue to arrive. Officer Burns was taken immediately into surgery, which lasted 6 plus hours. There is no question that the actions of both Officer Leonard by applying immediate first aid, and Officer Cornell’s decision to transport to the hospital, saved the life of Officer Burns.

Sergeant Craig Baumfaulk and Officer T.J. Campagna stayed with Officer Burns for the duration of the surgery, reassuring him that he would be ok, and relaying information to his family and APD leadership to keep them constantly updated. The response and support to this incident was overwhelming, with close to two hundred officers arriving in the area, including DPD, to establish a perimeter, search for the suspect, and set up command operations. The actions of all officers, dispatchers, and civilians involved were vital to the overall mission, investigation, and later successful prosecution.

For demonstrating exceptional professionalism and bravery in the face of such a horrific and traumatic event, Officer Dale Leonard is commended for his actions and is hereby awarded the Aurora Police Department’s Distinguished Service Cross.
Officer Stephenson Cary, Officer Robert Wong, Officer Brandon Meadows, Officer William Hummel, Officer Jeff Olson

On April 27th, 2014 at 0240hrs., APD units were dispatched to 1661 Geneva St., Apt#6, on a report of domestic violence incident. The female (victim) at the location was reporting her boyfriend (suspect) had threatened to kill her and their two children with a knife. Suspect was on cocaine and very violent. Victim was able to escape the apartment, but left her two boys, ages 5 and 8 inside. Officers’ Wong, Meadows, Olson, Hummel and Cary arrived on scene and immediately formed an arrest and entry team. As they approached they could hear the children screaming from inside the apartment. Officers’ were able to see the suspect through a window holding a knife. The suspect was given verbal orders to drop the knife and open the door, which he ignored and took the children into a back bedroom. The Officers’ fearing for the lives of the boys made immediate entry. As a team the Officers’ entered the apartment and converged on the bedroom. They opened the door of the bedroom and one of the boys, the 8yo, ran out, screaming, bleeding from a cut on his hand. The 5yo was sitting on a bed, crying and screaming, as the suspect stood next to the bed, knife still in hand. The Officers rushed into the bedroom where Cary and Olson grabbed the child and removed him from danger. Wong, Meadows and Hummel engaged the armed suspect, ordering him to surrender and comply. The suspect dropped the knife and was taken into custody without the use of deadly force. It was later learned that when the Officers entered the apartment the suspect grabbed the 8yo and held the knife to his throat. The 8yo, fearing for his life, grabbed onto the knife blade attempted to disarm the suspect, cutting his hand, prior to Officers entry into the bedroom.
Purple Heart

The Purple Heart may be awarded by the Chief of Police to any member who sustains a gunshot wound, stab wound, or serious injury, under aggravated and hostile circumstances, which could have resulted in death or could potentially result in a permanent disability, which may force the member to retire. This award will be a medal, pin, and a certificate presented by the Chief of Police.

The department presented two (2) Purple Heart award in 2015.

Officer Thomas Faustin

On May 4, 2015 at approximately 0027 hours, Officer Thomas Faustin was conducting a traffic stop in the area of E. Colfax Ave. and Moline St. Officer Faustin was walking back to his patrol vehicle after contacting the driver regarding the traffic stop. Officer Faustin observed a vehicle change lanes from the inside to the outside lanes of traffic as it approached the location. Officer Faustin initially stopped in front of his patrol vehicle in order to wait for the vehicle to pass. However, the vehicle stopped just short of his patrol vehicle in a manner indicative of a motorist waiting for the officer to return to his vehicle. Once Officer Faustin stepped out from in front of his patrol vehicle, the suspect vehicle immediately accelerated, squealing its tires and drove directly at Officer Faustin. The suspect vehicle struck Officer Faustin’s legs and the front driver’s side quarter panel of his patrol vehicle. The impact threw Officer Faustin onto the hood of his patrol vehicle and he subsequently fell to the ground. Officer Faustin immediately got into his patrol vehicle and began to pursue the suspect vehicle, which was trying to flee the area. Although Officer Faustin had sustained injury to his legs after being struck by the suspect vehicle, he continued to pursue and kept a visual on the suspect vehicle while calmly airing the information. Officer Faustin was forced to stop his pursuit after his patrol vehicle began to smoke and become inoperable, however assisting officers were able to get in the area to obtain a partial plate and suspect description before the vehicle evaded the police at a high rate of speed. After having what appeared to be an attempt on Officer Faustin’s life, he was still able to engage the suspect in a pursuit that allowed officers to obtain critical information that resulted in the arrest of the suspect later that night. Officer Faustin showed exceptional bravery in recovering from such a violent assault and engaging in a pursuit with a suspect that he believe posed a great risk to citizens, officers and himself.
For wounds suffered as result of this encounter, Officer Thomas Faustin is hereby awarded the Aurora Police Department - Purple Heart.

**Officer Ryan Burns**

On November 14th, 2014 at around 9 p.m., Officer Ryan Burns and Officer Dale Leonard were riding as a two officer unit performing routine patrol duties. They initiated a traffic stop on a suspicious vehicle that unknown to them had just been stolen from E. 17th Ave. and Fulton St. Upon approaching the vehicle the driver of the car fired several shots at Officer Burns with a handgun. Officer Burns was struck in the right leg above the knee, inflicting severe life threatening injuries. Officer Leonard immediately returned fire in defense of Officer Burns and himself as the vehicle sped away. Officer Leonard observed that Officer Burns was severely wounded and was losing a significant amount of blood. Officer Leonard immediately applied a tourniquet to Officer Burns’ leg to stop the bleeding. Officer Joseph Cornell arrived on scene and made the life saving decision to load Officer Burns into his patrol car and transport him to the ER at University Hospital rather than wait for rescue to arrive. Officer Burns was taken immediately into surgery, which lasted 6 plus hours. There is no question that the actions of both Officer Leonard by applying immediate first aid, and Officer Cornell’s decision to transport to the hospital, saved the life of Officer Burns.

Sergeant Craig Baumfaulk and Officer T.J. Campagna stayed with Officer Burns for the duration of the surgery, reassuring him that he would be ok, and relaying information to his family and APD leadership to keep them constantly updated. The response and support to this incident was overwhelming, with close to two hundred officers arriving in the area, including DPD, to establish a perimeter, search for the suspect, and set up command operations. The actions of all officers, dispatchers, and civilians involved were vital to the overall mission, investigation, and later successful prosecution.

For sustaining life threatening wounds in the line of duty as a result of this horrific encounter, Officer Ryan Burns was awarded the Aurora Police Department’s Purple Heart Medal.
Life Saving Award

The Life Saving Award may be awarded by the Chief of Police to members who personally save a life. The life-saving effort will normally involve one of the learned life supporting processes: mouth-to-mouth resuscitation, cardio-pulmonary resuscitation, the Heimlich maneuver for choking victims, or the control of severe bleeding. Actions meriting this award will be significant actions by the member. The award will only be bestowed if the victim survives the incident. The request for a life-saving award will be accompanied by a document from witnesses or an attending physician stating the methods applied contributed significantly to the victim’s survival. This award will only apply when victims are at imminent risk of death. This will normally not include deliberate actions taken by the victims, unless the victims have inflicted injury upon themselves that is actually life threatening. This award will be a pin and certificate presented by the Chief of Police.

The department presented twenty (20) Life Saving Awards in 2015.

Sergeant Graham Dunne

On August 30, 2015, Sergeant Graham Dunne responded to 10590 E. 25th Avenue reference a party hanging in the garage. A neighbor and the male’s wife cut him down prior to Sergeant Dunne’s arrival. As Sergeant Dunne arrived, he found the male was laying on his side on the ground and his wife and neighbors were standing by, the male was not breathing and had no pulse. Sergeant Dunne rolled the male onto his back and tilted his head to facilitate an open airway, he was still not breathing. Sergeant Dunne started CPR, after about two minutes another officer checked for a pulse at the ankle and found that with the compressions there was blood flow. Rescue arrived about three minutes into performing CPR and took over. They transported the male the University Hospital. Without the quick actions of Sergeant Dunne, the male would not have survived.

Sergeant Graham was awarded the Life Saving Award for his efforts.

Lieutenant Marc Paolino and Officer Specialist Darryll Huntsman

On April 11, 2015 at 4:22 pm Officers were dispatched to the Best Western located at 800 S. Abilene St. on a report of a suicidal male with a gun. Sergeant Brian Saupe was first to arrive and was able to obtain a key card and room number for the male. At one point the male opened the door but then shut it quickly. Officer Darryll Huntsman and Sergeant Marc Paolino arrived on scene, they could hear what they thought was the male barricading the door. Sergeant Paolino and Officer Huntsman then evacuated the second floor of the hotel. Sergeant Saupe attempted to make contact with the male by phone and knocking on the door. When they had no contact they used the key card to enter the room where they found the male hanging by a bed sheet behind the door. Officer Huntsman was able to untie the male and lower him to the ground at which time he was unconscious and not breathing. Officer Huntsman removed the sheet from around his neck and checked for a pulse. The male came to a short time later and was transported to the hospital where he made a full recovery.
The lifesaving actions of these Aurora Police Department members shows a tremendous example of commitment to community, selfless service and teamwork, providing this man with another opportunity at life. Sergeant Marc Paolino and Officer Specialist Darryll Huntsman are hereby awarded the Aurora Police Department Life Saving Award.

**Officer Patricia Southwick**

On June 4, 2015, officers were dispatched to a welfare check where a female had cut her arms and had a history of suicide attempts. Officer Patty Southwick arrived first and took control of the female who had cut her upper left arm and was covered in blood. Officer Keith Matthews arrived and took control of the female’s right arm as she was still struggling with Officer Southwick. Officer Lonnie Crump arrived and handed a tourniquet to Officer Southwick who applied the tourniquet. At this time the three officers were able to control the female and stop the bleeding. A 5 inch steak knife was located in the kitchen and large amounts of blood on the floors where she had cut herself and was struggling with the officers. Rescue arrived and transported the female to the hospital. Due to the amount of blood loss, if Officer Southwick would not have applied the tourniquet, the female would have lost an arm and possibly her life. The life saving actions of these officers shows a tremendous example of commitment to community, selfless service and teamwork, providing this female with another opportunity at life.

Officer Patricia Southwick was awarded the Aurora Police Department’s Life Saving Award

**Officer Michael Moore**

On September 21, 2015, Officer Michael Moore was dispatched to General’s Park at 1561 Quentin Street on a report of a man down. The man was face down, had stopped breathing and was turning purple. Officer Moore rolled the man on his back and positioned his head to open the airway. Officer Moore prepared to start CPR and removed some clothing from the man’s chest. A weak pulse was detected and the man started to gasp for air. University of Colorado Police Officers arrived, followed by Aurora Fire Rescue personnel. The man was transported to the hospital and made a full recovery. The University officers stated that Officer Moore’s initial actions were instrumental in saving the man’s life.

Officer Michael Moore is hereby awarded the Aurora Police Department’s Life Saving Award.

**Officer Steven Cortese and Officer Clark Orchard**

On November 16, 2015 Officer Steven Cortese observed a man lying in the parking lot at 11025 E Colfax Ave. A woman was next to the male attempting some type of first aid. Officer Cortese observed that the male was turning blue, was not breathing and was not responding to verbal commands. Officer Cortese learned from the female the male was suffering from a heroin overdose and she had attempted to inject him with Narcan but broke the needle. Shortly after starting CPR Officer Clark Orchard arrived on scene and relieved Officer Cortese and continued the CPR on the male. Officer Orchard checked for a pulse and the male began to breathe on his own. Rescue arrived on scene and transported the male to the hospital where he fully recovered.

The life saving actions of these Aurora Police Department officers shows a tremendous example of commitment to community, selfless service and teamwork, providing this man with another opportunity
at life. Officer Steven Cortese and Officer Clark Orchard are hereby awarded the Aurora Police Department Life Saving Award.

**Officer Daniel Veith**

On March 15, 2015, at approximately 4:30 a.m., Officer Daniel Veith was dispatched to 1429 Macon Street, Apt. 8 on a fire assist. Dispatch was having difficulty getting clear information from the reporting party, but aired that the incident was regarding a 21-year old male that was unconscious and not breathing. On arrival, there were a number of people in the apartment, but no one could communicate clearly with Officer Veith to explain the situation. The residents were from Nepal and only spoke Burmese, putting Officer Veith in a situation where he had to rely solely on his training and experience to assess the situation. Officer Veith observed Prabish Rai (09/25/94) laying on the living room floor. Rai was unconscious, had no pulse and was not breathing. Officer Veith immediately determined that life saving measures needed to be taken and began to administer CPR. Officer Veith was alone on the scene for a number of minutes and administered approximately 200 compressions waiting for paramedics to arrive on scene. Once rescue arrived on scene, they took over CPR and Rai was immediately transported to the University of Colorado Hospital. As a result of Officer Veith’s initial lifesaving efforts in conjunction with the Aurora Fire Department’s procedures, Rai’s life was saved.

For demonstrating exceptional professionalism and skill, Officer Daniel Veith is commended for his life saving actions and is hereby awarded the Aurora Police Department’s Life Saving Award.

**Officer Dale Leonard and Officer Joseph Cornell**

On November 14th, 2014 at around 9 p.m., Officer Ryan Burns and Officer Dale Leonard were riding as a two officer unit performing routine patrol duties. They initiated a traffic stop on a suspicious vehicle that unknown to them had just been stolen from E. 17th Ave. and Fulton St. Upon approaching the vehicle the driver of the car fired several shots at Officer Burns with a handgun. Officer Burns was struck in the right leg above the knee, inflicting severe life threatening injuries. Officer Leonard immediately returned fire in defense of Officer Burns and himself as the vehicle sped away. Officer Leonard observed that Officer Burns was severely wounded and was losing a significant amount of blood. Officer Leonard immediately applied a tourniquet to Officer Burns’ leg to stop the bleeding. Officer Joseph Cornell arrived on scene and made the life saving decision to load Officer Burns into his patrol car and transport him to the ER at University Hospital rather than wait for rescue to arrive. Officer Burns was taken immediately into surgery, which lasted 6 plus hours. There is no question that the actions of both Officer Leonard by applying immediate first aid, and Officer Cornell’s decision to transport to the hospital, saved the life of Officer Burns.

Sergeant Craig Baumfaulk and Officer T.J. Campagna stayed with Officer Burns for the duration of the surgery, reassuring him that he would be ok, and relaying information to his family and APD leadership to keep them constantly updated. The response and support to this incident was overwhelming, with close to two hundred officers arriving in the area, including DPD, to establish a perimeter, search for the suspect, and set up command operations. The actions of all officers, dispatchers, and civilians involved were vital to the overall mission, investigation, and later successful prosecution.

For saving the life of Officer Ryan Burns, Officer Specialist Dale Leonard and Officer Joseph Cornell were awarded the Aurora Police Department’s Life Saving Award.
Sergeant Tim Holt, Officer Brandon Meadows, Officer Jeremy McElroy, Officer Victor Oviedo, Officer Ryan Burke, Officer Mark Moore, Officer Ryan Marker, Officer Jeff Olson, Officer Virgil Majors, Officer Christopher Thivierge

On October 4, 2014, at approximately 4:26 am, Officer Richard Romero aired to District 1 officers that a vehicle was traveling the wrong way on Interstate 225. He stated the vehicle was traveling south, in the north bound lanes of the interstate. Officer Benjamin Petering observed the red in color GMC Sierra (suspect) driving south on the west shoulder of northbound Interstate 225 approaching Alameda Avenue. Officer Brandon Meadows was south on I-225 in an effort to assist Officer Petering with the traffic stop. The suspect stopped on I-225 just north of Alameda Avenue. Officer Petering exited his patrol car and began to approach the GMC Sierra. As he neared, the suspect began to drive away, still traveling south in the north bound lanes of a well-traveled interstate. Sergeant Tim Holt was traveling south in the south bound lanes of Interstate 225. Sgt. Holt kept a constant watch on the vehicle as he paralleled the truck going south on Interstate 225. Just south of Mississippi Avenue, Sgt. Holt observed sparks from where a collision had occurred. Sgt. Holt then saw the GMC Sierra laying on its side. Sgt. Holt could clearly see that the male suspect had been ejected and was trapped underneath the truck. Sgt. Holt observed the suspect was still breathing, although it was slow, deliberate and extremely labored. Numerous other Officers in the area responded to the crash scene to assist. Two Childrens' Hospital Flight for Life Medics happened to be driving on the interstate at this time and also stopped to assist, Adam O'Leary and Zack Quimby. Citizen Jeff Byers (one of the victim vehicles on NB I225) also assisted. Realizing that the suspect’s life was clearly in danger, Sgt. Holt, officers on scene, and the three citizens, surrounded the GMC Sierra and physically lifted the truck to free the suspect from the crushing weight. Officer Jeffrey Olson and Officer Ryan Burke pulled the suspect from the under the wreckage. The suspect’s left arm was partially amputated near the bicep area. Officer Mark Moore applied a tourniquet to the suspect’s left arm near the bicep area in an attempt to stop the massive blood loss. The suspect’s left arm was eventually amputated at the hospital during surgical procedures, but he did survive the crash and is currently recovering from his injuries. The life saving actions of these Aurora Police Department officers, along with the assistance of several citizens, shows a tremendous example of commitment to community, selfless service and teamwork, providing this man with another opportunity at life.
The Meritorious Service Ribbon may be awarded by the Chief of Police for service rendered in the line of duty when a member, because of diligence and perseverance, performs difficult tasks under unusual circumstances and goes far beyond that which is normally expected of members. This award will be a pin and certificate presented by the Chief of Police.

The department presented twenty-two (22) Meritorious Services Ribbons in 2015.

**Sergeant Matthew Brukhacher**
On August 6th, 2015, Sergeant Brukbacher was covering an officer when a routine traffic stop was conducted which rapidly developed into a scene of charged racial tension and hostility. During this volatile situation, Sergeant Brukbacher’s disciplined leadership under pressure successfully inspired the officers to maintain their professional composure and the appropriate use of force for the situation. His ability to multi-task was soundly tested as he maintained situational awareness of the violently resisting suspect and the suspect’s encroaching crowds of hostile supporters who were verbally and physically interjecting themselves into the situation. Sergeant Brukbacher’s leadership of twenty-four APD officers at various fronts ensured the safety of the APD officers as well as the safety of the aggressive crowd members and ultimately resulted in the successful arrest of the suspect. Sergeant Brukbacher was there upon initial contact with the offender, coordinated additional resources, and stayed until he ensured all officers had safely departed the area.

Sergeant Matthew Brukbacher was awarded the Meritorious Service Ribbon.

**Officer Steven Gerdjikian**
On December 18th, 2015, at about 4:22 a.m., officers were dispatched to a report of a suicidal female who was intoxicated and was planning on jumping off of a bridge onto the E-470 highway. Officer Steven Gerdjikian located the female on the Hampden Avenue overpass. Other officers shined lights on the woman and distracted her. Officer Gerdjikian was able to grab her as she was climbing the bridge rails and pull her away from the edge of the bridge, preventing a possible suicide attempt and safely resolving the situation.

Officer Steven Gerdjikian was awarded the Meritorious Service Ribbon.

**Officer Levi Huffine**
On the evening of November 22, 2015 Officer Levi Huffine was dispatched to 2241 Fulton Street on the report of a car fire. Upon arrival Officer Huffine saw flames shooting from under the vehicle and the passenger compartment was filled with smoke. Officer Huffine opened the driver’s door and found an unresponsive male. Officer Huffine could now see that the flames had traveled into the passenger compartment. The male was resisting Officer Huffine’s attempt to remove him from the vehicle. Officer
Huffine was able to pull the male from the vehicle and pulled him to a safe location. By the time Aurora Fire arrived the vehicle was fully engulfed in flames. Aurora Arson Investigators stated that Officer Huffine put himself at risk of injury due to exposure of toxic products and an active fuel fire that was burning under the vehicle.

For his performance of difficult tasks under unusual circumstances brings great credit upon himself and the Aurora Police Department, Officer Levi Huffine is hereby awarded the Aurora Police Department’s Meritorious Service Ribbon.

**Officer Paul Seiwald and Officer David Wilson**

On September 10, 2015 Officers David Wilson and Paul Seiwald responded to the intersection of Picadilly Road and Highway 30 on a report of a traffic crash involving multiple injuries. Officer Wilson arrived first and pulled a crash victim from one of the cars which had flipped onto its roof. A short time later Officer Seiwald arrived and crawled into the car to check on the condition of the driver which he found to be deceased. Officer Seiwald then found a seven year old female trapped in the back seat. Officer Seiwald could see the child had serious injuries and needed to be removed due to fears it may catch fire. Officer Wilson crawled into the trunk of the car to cut the seat belt which was holding the child in the car. The officers were unable to free the child but remained with her providing comfort and reassurance while firefighters from Aurora Fire cut the child out of the car.

For demonstrating exceptional professionalism and bravery, Officer Paul Seiwald and Officer David Wilson were commended for their actions and were awarded to Aurora Police Department’s Meritorious Service Ribbon.

**Sergeant John Kessler, Officer Gerald Armstrong, and Officer Marc Sears**

On October 21, 2015 officers were dispatched to a one car accident at E. 6th Ave. and Interstate 225 were the vehicle had run off the road into a retention pond, and no one had exited the vehicle yet. Sergeant Jonathan Kessler was first on scene and could see a small car in the pond with the windows up, doors closed and the water level to the top of the door frame. A witness reported that he saw the car go into the pond and no one had exited yet. As Sergeant Kessler was entering the pond to check the car he could see an outline of a person in the driver’s seat. The doors were locked and the person was not responding as Sergeant Kessler was yelling through the closed window. Officer Marc Sears arrived on scene, Sergeant Kessler told him to run and grab something to break the window. As Sergeant Kessler was waiting he tried the rear driver side door which was unlocked. The female driver was shaking uncontrollably and unresponsive. Sergeant Kessler was able to unlock the driver door by reaching around the driver seat. Officer Gerald Armstrong arrived on scene and with Officer Sears and Sergeant Kessler were able to pull the female out of the car and carried her to the bank of the pond. Rescue arrived on scene and transported her to the hospital.

For performing a difficult task, under unusual circumstances, Sergeant Jonathan Kessler is commended for his actions and is hereby awarded the Aurora Police Department - Meritorious Service Ribbon.
Sergeant Cassidee Carlson, Officer Michael Eli, and Officer Timothy Jeffrey
On April 22, 2015 officers responded to 16250 E. 40th Ave. on a report of a possible hostage situation in a room on the 6th floor. The first arriving officers learned that a housekeeper was being held by a male who was on drugs. Realizing the potential harm to the employee officers established an emergency arrest team and began to develop a rescue plan. Officer Mel Cobb set himself up in an adjoining room where he could attempt to listen to conversations and attempt contact with the male and victim. Officer Dan Iovine arrived shortly after and took position as the officer in charge of the rescue team. As more officers arrived the rescue team was adjusted to have Sergeant Barry Cape and Officer Mike Eli as breachers with Officer Iovine and Officer Seiwald as first to enter the room followed by Sergeant Mike Holm. Due to the construction of the door, when breached only the lower half broke off causing the initial officers to crawl through a hole in the door to make entry into the room. The male had choked the victim and was dragging her around the room, threatening to throw her out a broken window. Members were given the order to execute the rescue. Officer Iovine and Officer Seiwald entered the room first and contacted the male who was in the process of assaulting the male, all four ended up on the floor where a violent fight ensued. Sergeant Holm was able to get the victim away from the suspect and pass her off to Officer Eli who safely removed her from the room. Sergeant Carlson and Officer Tim Jeffrey tased the male; when that did not stop him from fighting, Officer Seiwald utilized the carotid control hold, at which time officers were able to handcuff the male and eventually place him in a hobble. Due to the quick actions of all officers involved and the rescue plan set up the hostage was rescued safety and the suspect arrested.

For performing a difficult task, under unusual circumstances, Sergeant Cassidee Carlson, Officer Michael Eli, and Officer Timothy Jeffrey are commended for their actions and are hereby awarded the Aurora Police Department - Meritorious Service Ribbon.

Officer Thomas Faustin
On May 4, 2015 at approximately 0027 hours, Officer Thomas Faustin was conducting a traffic stop in the area of E. Colfax Ave. and Moline St. Officer Faustin was walking back to his patrol vehicle after contacting the driver regarding the traffic stop. Officer Faustin observed a vehicle change lanes from the inside to the outside lanes of traffic as it approached the location. Officer Faustin initially stopped in front of his patrol vehicle in order to wait for the vehicle to pass. However, the vehicle stopped just short of his patrol vehicle in a manner indicative of a motorist waiting for the officer to return to his vehicle. Once Officer Faustin stepped out from in front of his patrol vehicle, the suspect vehicle immediately accelerated, squealing its tires and drove directly at Officer Faustin. The suspect vehicle struck Officer Faustin's legs and the front driver's side quarter panel of his patrol vehicle. The impact threw Officer Faustin onto the hood of his patrol vehicle and he subsequently fell to the ground. Officer Faustin immediately got into his patrol vehicle and began to pursue the suspect vehicle, which was trying to flee the area. Although Officer Faustin had sustained injury to his legs after being struck by the suspect vehicle, he continued to pursue and kept a visual on the suspect vehicle while calmly airing the information. Officer Faustin was forced to stop his pursuit after his patrol vehicle began to smoke and become inoperable, however assisting officers were able to get in the area to obtain a
partial plate and suspect description before the vehicle evaded the police at a high rate of speed. After having what appeared to be an attempt on Officer Faustin’s life, he was still able to engage the suspect in a pursuit that allowed officers to obtain critical information that resulted in the arrest of the suspect later that night. Officer Faustin showed exceptional bravery in recovering from such a violent assault and engaging in a pursuit with a suspect that he believes posed a great risk to citizens, officers and himself.

For his actions in the immediate aftermath of being struck by a car and pursuing the offender, going above that which is normally expected of members, Officer Thomas Faustin is hereby awarded the Aurora Police Department – Meritorious Service Ribbon.

**Officer Ryan Burns and Officer Joseph Cornell**

On November 14th, 2014 at around 9 p.m., Officer Ryan Burns and Officer Dale Leonard were riding as a two officer unit performing routine patrol duties. They initiated a traffic stop on a suspicious vehicle that unknown to them had just been stolen from E. 17th Ave. and Fulton St. Upon approaching the vehicle the driver of the car fired several shots at Officer Burns with a handgun. Officer Burns was struck in the right leg above the knee, inflicting severe life threatening injuries. Officer Leonard immediately returned fire in defense of Officer Burns and himself as the vehicle sped away. Officer Leonard observed that Officer Burns was severely wounded and was losing a significant amount of blood. Officer Leonard immediately applied a tourniquet to Officer Burns’ leg to stop the bleeding. Officer Joseph Cornell arrived on scene and made the life-saving decision to load Officer Burns into his patrol car and transport him to the ER at University Hospital rather than wait for rescue to arrive. Officer Burns was taken immediately into surgery, which lasted 6 plus hours. There is no question that the actions of both Officer Leonard by applying immediate first aid, and Officer Cornell’s decision to transport to the hospital, saved the life of Officer Burns.

Sergeant Craig Baumfaulk and Officer T.J. Campagna stayed with Officer Burns for the duration of the surgery, reassuring him that he would be ok, and relaying information to his family and APD leadership to keep them constantly updated. The response and support to this incident was overwhelming, with close to two hundred officers arriving in the area, including DPD, to establish a perimeter, search for the suspect, and set up command operations. The actions of all officers, dispatchers, and civilians involved were vital to the overall mission, investigation, and later successful prosecution.

For his efforts in coordinating the initial response at the hospital under difficult and unusual circumstances, Officer Joseph Cornell was awarded the Aurora Police Department - Meritorious Service Ribbon.

For his bravery and commitment during a lengthy and painful recovery, Officer Ryan Burns was awarded the Aurora Police Department - Meritorious Service Ribbon.

**Officer Paul Cancino, Officer Brant Harrold, Officer Paul Jerothe**

On August 12, 2014, at about 8:20pm, District 1 patrol responded to the area of I-225 SB HWY @ E. 6th Ave on a report of a male sitting on the bridge looking like he was going to jump off. Officers arrived to find a 21yo adult Hispanic male sitting on the I-225 bridge over the E. 6th Ave. eastbound lanes. He had
climbed over the small chain link fence atop the concrete guard rail with the intentions of jumping off to commit suicide. Officer Paul Cancino, CIT trained, arrived and immediately began talking with the subject. The subject’s wife and child arrived on scene a short time later and it was discovered he has a history of depression. Trained rappel SWAT Officers Brant Harrold and Paul Jerothe quickly set up on the bridge directly behind the subject and tied ropes around their waist and secured it to their police truck in the event they had to grab the subject. While Cancino continued to talk with the subject he continued making suicidal threats. A plan was made that if the opportunity presented itself Officers Harrold and Jerothe would grab him and pull him over the fence. Officer Cancino was made aware of this and did an outstanding job talking to the subject in an attempt to get him to give up while at the same time keeping his attention diverted from what Officers Harrold and Jerothe were doing. At one point the subject raised his arms and placed them on top of the fence making it possible to grab and secure him. Officers Harrold and Jerothe quickly jumped up on the guardrail, reached over the fence, and grabbed onto the subject’s arms. He resisted, but was successfully pulled up and over the fence. Officers Harrold and Jerothe performed a difficult task, under unusual circumstances, going far beyond what is normally expected of members, putting themselves at risk for serious bodily injury when they launched themselves over a fence sitting several stories above E. 6th Avenue. The actions of Officers Harrold, Jerothe, and Cancino, all contributed in keeping the subject from jumping off the overpass in full view of the public, as the fall certainly would have caused serious injury or death.

Sergeant Mike Gaskill, Agent Mike Thrapp, and Officer Kevin Rossi
In 2012 the City of Aurora experienced an escalation on gang crimes. The crimes were tied to two different gangs, the Rollin 60’s and the 83 Gangster Crips. Sergeant Mike Gaskill, Agent Mike Thrapp and Officer Kevin Rossi partnered with the Arapahoe County District Attorney’s office, Mike Angel and Daniel Seidel, to begin a grand jury case against the Rollin 60’s in order to reduce this escalation of violence. The Rollin 60’s were first documented in Los Angeles, California in the 1970’s and became notorious for their violence. The Rollin 60’s spread to Aurora in the 1980’s and continue their presence today. The subsequent two year investigation by the Aurora Police Department’s Gang Investigation Unit, the 18th Judicial District Attorney’s Office and the Federal Bureau of Investigations Rocky Mountain Safe Street Task Force resulted in a 73 count indictment and the arrest of 25 members and associates of the Rollin 60’s street gang. The primary indictments consisted of shootings, assaults and robberies. The Rollin 60’s focus on stranger robberies with a showing of force through weapons and/or numbers or drug related robberies, again through the use of force and numbers. In addition, many members of the gang committed burglaries with the goal of obtaining guns to sell back to the gang. The Rollin 60’s also engaged in violent and assaultive conduct to increase their reputation within the broader community. The hard work and dedication of everyone involved in this case resulted in a substantial impact on the Rollin 60’s and their ability to negatively impact the community. This cooperative, complex investigation against a violent street gang benefited the entire community and can be used as a model for future investigations and prosecutions.

Officer Erick Ortiz
On June 6th, 2014, at 4:00pm, APD patrol officers responded to 3358 S. Nucla Way on a report of a possible suicidal adult male that was threatening to harm himself and may be armed with a rifle. District 3 DART Officers Erick Ortiz and Thomas Lord were riding as a two man unit and responded to the scene. They parked three houses down from the address and approached the location on foot. They observed
an adult male standing in the driveway of the residence, talking on the phone, going back and forth in and out of the open garage. As they walked closer Officer Lord yelled out, “Rifle!” Both officers retreated to cover and concealment, airing the information to other responding officers. Officer Ortiz retrieved his duty rifle from his patrol vehicle and took up a position on the west side of the street behind the engine hood of a parked pick up truck. Erick observed the other officers coming up behind him, and from the other direction to the south. At the same time he observed the male subject reacting to their actions, walking in and out of the garage and bringing the rifle up to his shoulder level several times. Based on the aggressive actions of the subject, Officer Ortiz perceived that the lives of his fellow officers were in danger and used deadly force by firing his duty rifle to eliminate the threat. Officer Ortiz is commended for his actions, making a very difficult decision under unusual circumstances in order to protect the lives of his fellow officers.

**Officer Beau Ewen**

On November 3, 2014 officers were dispatched to 1765 N. Chester St. on reports of a man chasing others in the area with a knife. Officer Beau Ewen was in the area and witnessed the suspect chasing another man with a large kitchen knife into the courtyard. Officer Ewen, by himself and knowing the dangerous situation, left the safety of his patrol car and confronted the suspect, who stopped his pursuit of the victim and turned his attention to Officer Ewen. The suspect at first refused to drop the 10” knife. Following repeated requests the suspect then tossed the knife to the ground and rushed at Officer Ewen, who was able to transition to his taser. He then deployed the taser to subdue suspect until help could arrive. The suspect continued to thrash and fight with the officers who arrived to assist and eventually had to be chemically compelled to stop fighting by Aurora paramedics. For performing a difficult task, under unusual circumstances, Officer Beau Ewen was commended for his actions and is hereby awarded the Aurora Police Department’s Meritorious Service Ribbon.
Chief’s Commendation Certificate

The Chief’s Commendation Certificate may be awarded by the Chief of Police to a member for exceptional contribution to the progress of the Department, or to individuals who perform their duties in an unusually effective manner. The contribution must be adopted by the Department and increase the administrative or operational efficiency of the Department. The Chief of Police may recognize individual members of other law enforcement organizations, or multi-jurisdictional task forces, for this award.

The department presented ninety-six (103) Chief’s Commendation Certificates in 2015.

David Ord (Crime Scene Investigator)
CSI Technician David Ord is the Crime Scene Investigator responsible for the Video Evidence Recovery for the Aurora Police Department’s Crime Scene Investigation Section. He is the main source for detectives and officers when video evidence needs to be collected from video surveillance systems, as no surveillance systems are ever the same. Even systems by the same manufacturer often have been set up differently and require additional inquiry and research. David has gone as far as spending time on the phone with companies or vendors as far away as China to access the data correctly. An example of David’s commitment was when he responded to a liquor store at the request of a detective while on his way home from work in his own personal vehicle. David has, and continues to go above and beyond what is expected of him, providing excellent customer service and maintains the integrity of all evidence he collects for future prosecution. For providing an exceptional contribution to the progress of the department by performing his duties in an unusually effective manner CSI Investigator David Ord is hereby awarded the Aurora Police Department’s Chief’s Commendation.

Sergeant Graham Dunne
On December 28, 2015, Sergeant Graham Dunne, being aware of several armed robberies committed by the same suspect, took it upon himself to try and find the offender. Sergeant Dunne knew from a bulletin that the suspect’s mother was staying at a local motel and checked the parking lot. He saw the suspect standing outside smoking a cigarette. The Sergeant initiated a foot pursuit with the suspect and located him in a room in the motel. Sergeant Dunne held the suspect at gun point until backup officers arrived. Sergeant Graham Dunne showed great commitment to the city of Aurora and safely apprehended a dangerous armed criminal.

Agent Stephen Conner
While investigating a cold murder case, 05-31673, Detective Steve Conner showed great tenacity and investigative skill. Due to his work in methodically reviewing this cold case and developing new evidence and witness statements, justice was served. Detective Conner showed great dedication to making sure the victim, Carolyn Colleen Jansen, was not forgotten and his diligence was instrumental in a successful prosecution and a guilty verdict. His hard work and professionalism reflects not only on himself but the men and women of the Aurora Police Department.

Crime Analyst Jamie Newsum and Crime Analyst Ruth Eisner
In 2014 the Aurora Police Department was granted a JAG grant to hire a part time Crime Analyst for the Traffic Section. The job would be a contract position. After numerous interviews Jamie Newsum was
selected and accepted the job. Having very little knowledge of what the job would entail Jamie remained positive and accepted any assignment or task given to her. Chief Metz later tasked the traffic section to develop a DDACTS model program of law enforcement for the department. This operational model integrates location based crime and traffic crash data to determine the most effective methods for deploying law enforcement and other resources Jamie, with her mentor, Senior Crime Analyst Ruth Eisner, went to work, collecting over five years worth of crime and traffic data for the entire city. From this data a schedule was developed for each district, advising when and where to place officers for enforcement and high visibility. The goal was to decrease crime and accidents in those selected areas, while increasing discretionary time for officers to do proactive community police work. This was a monumental task for both Jamie and Ruth. The model was accomplished in record time and presented to the District Commanders for immediate implementation. The DDACTS concept continues today, with adjustments being made constantly by Jamie and Ruth’s hard work and dedication in making Aurora a safer place for its citizen to live in.

Sergeant Matthew Brukbacher
Throughout 2014, Sergeant Matthew Brukbacher completed several projects on his own volition as he had recognized the significant needs of the Aurora Police Department’s Emergency Response Team (ERT). The projects included both outfitting the Department’s Mobile Command and Communications Unit (MCCU) with relevant and current audio/visual equipment, as well as specialized and general maintenance which had not been completed when ERT initially received the MCCU. Sergeant Brukbacher also researched and obtained new gas masks through APD seizure funds. Through his diligence, the Emergency Response Team received new/updated masks that are relevant to their duties in comparison to the standard issue Department gas mask. Through Sergeant Brukbacher’s tireless efforts, the MCCU is an extremely valuable command and control platform and the members of ERT and the citizens of Aurora benefit directly from the research and procurement of the unique gas masks.

Administrative Specialist Linda Mann
Administrative Specialist Linda Mann is being recognized for her significant contributions to the Record’s Section, along with the Aurora Police Department as a whole. Linda takes her job duties very seriously and is diligent with her tasks. She is responsible for overseeing approx. 800 various forms in the department and has been editing, updating, and creating new documents to be used throughout the department. She follows through with contacting individuals and departments to review the forms and works with PSS to get them uploaded into the system. She spent a great amount of time updating the department’s traffic summons, making traffic and patrol officers jobs easier and quicker out on the street. Linda recently volunteered to help out in the Chief’s office due to staffing issues, working closely with the Police Legal Advisor on Colorado Open Records Act (CORA) requests. She is extremely well-organized, focused, and enjoys being busy. She is always willing to lend a hand and goes the extra mile in the work she accomplishes.

Arapahoe County Sheriff’s Deputy Adam Lendi and Arapahoe County Sheriff’s K9 Orry
On September 17, 2015 at 1025 hours officers were dispatched to 4301 S. Andes Way on a burglary in progress. Officers confirmed that suspect Joseph Allen was inside the residence alone. Officers set up on the location and made announcements but no contact was made with the suspect, with no APD K9 on duty at the time, Sergeant McKinney requested assistance from Arapahoe County Sheriff’s Office K9
Unit. Deputy Adam Lendi was finishing up a demonstration at Eaglecrest High School and on his way home when the request came out. Deputy Lendi without hesitation headed over to the location with K9 Orry. Deputy Lendi deployed K9 Orry and held the perimeter while APD officers attempted negotiations. It was determined that K9 Orry would be deployed. Deputy Lendi first made announcements with no contact from the suspect. After the third attempt K9 Orry was deployed to begin clearing the living room, K9 Orry then ran down a hallway. As Deputy Lendi entered the residence he could hear a male yell “Officers” then start screaming as K9 Orry made bite contact. K9 Orry engaged the suspect’s right lower leg as the suspect was grabbing K9 Orry’s head on both sides. APD officers entered the room and grabbed the suspect’s arms and Deputy Lendi controlled K9 Orry as to not allow bites to the officers. Joseph Allen was placed into custody and transported to the hospital for his injuries. If not for the expedient assistance the outcome of this situation could have ended differently. The actions of Deputy Lendi reflect great credit upon himself and to the law enforcement profession as a whole.

**Administrative Technician Kellie Craft**

Administrative Technician Kellie Craft was recognized for her exceptional contributions to District 1 and to the Aurora Police Department. In September of 2014, Kellie embarked on an effort to help make the District 1 facility safer for those that work there. She worked side by side with Public Works to develop a site security plan that included fencing, gates, lighting and cameras. Because of her tenacious efforts, the design plans and budget were approved and implemented. The district station security upgrade was completed in March of 2015, on time and on budget. Due to her efforts, Kellie has helped pave the way for additional safety enhancements for both district two and three. Additionally, in the wake of a 2015 grand jury decision, Kellie was asked to assist in the organization and implementation of the department’s mutual-aid contingency planning book. The document was so comprehensive it was added to the department’s resource guide. Kellie also continues to make a difference at many levels. In addition to her day to day efforts, she has committed her time to the department’s Awards Board, Civilian Committee, EOC Logistics Team, and volunteered to assist the new SRT unit as their administrative support.

**Officer Ryan Marker**

On June 21, 2015, Sergeant Stephen Redfearn with EMATT put out a bulletin reference a stolen black Cadillac possibly being driven by an individual wanted on an attempt homicide warrant as well as being the driver of the stolen vehicle that had been pursued by FLAG, FAST and DART 3 the previous week. Later that evening, at approximately 8:00 pm, the vehicle tripped the License Plate Reader on E. Mississippi Avenue traveling westbound. Traffic Officer Ryan Marker was driving an unmarked patrol vehicle in the area and observed the suspect vehicle in the parking lot at E. Mississippi Avenue and S. Abilene Street. Officer Marker immediately contacted DART 3 officers to respond to attempt a tactical stop of the vehicle based upon the suspect’s violent actions and warrants. Officer Marker maintained visual observation of the vehicle as it left the location and began traveling north on I-225 where he was eventually joined by the DART officers. All continued to follow the suspect vehicle as it went west on I-70 to I-25. During this time, Officer Marker did an outstanding job calling out locations, trying to keep dispatch informed as channels were patched with other jurisdictions, while not being observed by the suspect. The suspect vehicle continued north on I-25 to Highway 36 and west towards Boulder. As the vehicle approached Westminster, Westminster PD was able to get in position and deploy stop sticks. A short pursuit by Westminster PD ensued, and the suspect was taken into custody a short time later
without further incident. Officer Marker is commended for his professionalism, and ability to remain calm as he communicated vital information to everyone involved in order to contain the vehicle and the violent suspect without it fleeing and placing the public in danger.

**Aurora for Youth Programs Program Assistant Jeanne-Anne Moran**

In July of 2013, Jeanne-Anne Moran began her career with the Aurora Police Department, which was the same year the Aurora for Youth Police programs were beginning. Her passion and commitment to these programs were immediately obvious and she has been instrumental in their success ever since. Jeanne-Anne frequently stays late, works weekends, and takes projects home to ensure timely and professional results. She has created posters and fliers for special events, and managed information documenting youth and officers involved on all the programs. The volunteers who prepare thousands of graduation bags for DARE and GREAT students are influenced by her supervisory skills and leadership. She is proactive in anticipating upcoming events and putting schedules and action plans in place, making the jobs of the people she works with easier. Jeanne-Anne always gives 100% each and every day, inspiring others to serve passionately in our service to the city and each other.

**Officer Roland Albert**

In February of 2015, Officer Roland Albert began teaching the “Success for Teens” program at Jefferson Hills and Excelsior Youth Centers. He has so far instructed over 150 students in this life skills educational program. He continues to bridge the prevention and intervention programs, impacting our youth who need it the most. Officer Albert has brought in guest speakers and motivated his students to a new level of situational awareness. He has become a positive role model for the Aurora for Youth APAC programs, which is much appreciated by the staff at both facilities, as well as the students he influences. His dedication and professionalism is affecting the future of our youth, one student at a time!

**Officer Specialist Lonnie Crump**

For over 9 years Officer Specialist Lonnie Crump has been a positive role model to Aurora’s youth, teaching DARE and GREAT programs at numerous schools. He has instructed at Wheeling, Mission Viejo, Jewell, and Peoria Elementary Schools with great success. When instructing at these schools, Lonnie does more than just show up and teach for a few weeks. He takes ownership of the school and the students, teaching a variety of topics to all ages. Lonnie is proactive and motivated to create programs that improve the safety and well-being of our youth. His approach to keeping students out of trouble and focused on their goals is commendable! He is respected and appreciated by school staff, parents, and mostly by the students he influences.

**Officer Jordan Odneal**

When the Aurora Police Department began teaching a new character trait development program called GREAT, Officer Jordan Odneal was the first officer to enthusiastically jump on board and begin instructing. Jordan volunteered to teach every 6th, 7th, and 8th grader in health class at South Middle School. His reviews and evaluations from students, staff, and parents have been outstanding! He continues to promote the program enthusiastically by recruiting more officers to teach, and getting additional schools to join in for the benefit of their students.
Officer Danno Singleton
Officer Danno Singleton is a shining example of the Aurora for Youth programs! He is a GREAT instructor, APAC Officer, Explorer Advisor, a member of the Teen Academy Staff, and the Director of the Police Explorer Academy. His dedication and commitment to these programs is amazing, requiring him to supervise the 16 week academy on weekends, along with the planning, scheduling, interaction with parents and creative problem solving that comes with everything. Danno is a great role model, mentor, and leader for the youth participating in these programs. His professionalism and dedication have made all the Aurora for Youth programs the success they have become to date.

Officer Dan Smick
Officer Dan Smick is the Assistant Director of the Police Explorer Academy. He has sacrificed many hours to this 16 week commitment of training, supervising, and getting recruits mentally and physically prepared for the challenges of becoming Aurora Police Explorers. Additionally, Dan is the lead instructor for the Explorer Shoot Team, coordinating the preparations and logistics for the Metro and LEEPAAC shooting competition event hosted by APD. Dan is a great model for the Explorers, motivating and inspiring them to be the best they can be. His dedication and professionalism have made the Aurora for Youth programs the success they are today.

Officer Dan Smick was commended for his actions and was awarded the Aurora Police Department’s Chief’s Commendation.

Sergeant Bill Revelle, Officer Chad Berger, Officer Travis Moody, Officer Jason Pray, Officer John Sangi
On July 18, 2015, Sergeant Bill Revelle, Officer Chad Berger, Officer Travis Moody, Officer Jason Pray and Officer John Sangi, along with Sergeant Revelle’s son Will and friend Timothy Franzen were enjoying an off-duty camping trip at the American Basin campground. A 14 year old girl ran into the campground to get help after her father’s leg was severely broken when a boulder rolled onto it. The off-duty officers assisted other volunteers in crossing treacherous terrain, guiding search and rescue responders, and evacuating the injured man. Rescuers had a 700 foot ascent to reach the victim. Officers Moody, Berger and Pray were each given 100 pounds of gear to carry. A national guard helicopter was unable to rescue the hiker due to the treacherous terrain, so the injured man had to be carried on a stretcher back to the campground, being lowered one person at a time.

For rendering critical assistance during this rescue, Sergeant Bill Revelle, Officer Chad Berger, Officer Travis Moody, Officer Jason Pray and Officer John Sangi were presented the Aurora Police Department’s Chief’s Commendation Certificate.

Officer John Campbell, Officer Eugene Cowell, Officer Matt Helfer, Officer Tom Muldoon
Officers Matt Helfer, Gene Colwell, John Campbell, and Tom Muldoon have consistently demonstrated outstanding sustained commitment to the Aurora community by volunteering year after year to prepare and serve the Senior Citizens Thanksgiving Dinner at the Fraternal Order of the Eagles Lodge in District 1. For 2015, the officers prepared and cooked 97 turkeys, 44 hams, 35 pans of stuffing, 30 gallons of gravy, 10 gallons of cranberry sauce, 800 pounds of potatoes, and 200 pounds of sweet potatoes. The meals were prepared as 600 to-go dinners for elderly persons unable to attend the event, 2,100 dinners for elderly persons attending the event, and 300 dinners sent for the less fortunate and homeless at the Denver Rescue Mission. While other officers, civilian volunteers, and members of the Aurora Fire
Department assisted with serving meals, these officers took on the bulk of the mission, spending countless hours over the years preparing for and participating in this community event. Their selfless commitment to others is much appreciated by the Fraternal Order of the Eagles and the hundreds of senior citizens participating in the event whom without this assistance would go without a Thanksgiving Holiday meal.

Officer John Campbell, Officer Eugene Colwell, Officer Matt Helfer, and Officer Tom Muldoon are commended for their actions and are hereby awarded the Aurora Police Department’s Chief’s Commendation.

**Property and Evidence Supervisor Rebecca Luna, Agent Alan Shank, Property Technician Cynthia Camp, Property Technician Sean Dailey, Property Technician Sherrie Knodel, Property Technician Michael Mittleider, and Property Technician Ashley Oberg**

Since June of 2013 the Aurora Police Department’s Property and Evidence Unit has gone through significant change. This has allowed the department to progressively move forward in instituting and maintaining the best business practices for the storage and preservation of property and evidence. Implementing new business practices included reorganizing all storage locations, renaming property locations, conducting audits and most recently preparing the MJC location for construction. This meant that all staff, property and evidence had to be temporarily moved from MJC to the warehouse at the Central Facilities. This was a monumental task that involved breaking down and moving heavy storage shelves, furniture, supplies and the relocation of over 40,000 items, both property and evidence, to the warehouse. The Aurora Police Department’s Property team; Mike, Sherri, Sean, Cindy, Alan, Ashley and Rebecca also moved into the warehouse becoming a very close knit family in the cramped working area. This was done without any outside professionals, saving the city several thousand dollars. Not only was the move and working in close proximity to one another stressful but the staff had to prepare and assist with three different audits while being housed in a temporary location. APD’s accreditation for CALEA was dependent on the Property and Evidence Unit successfully passing the CALEA audit. The team’s professionalism and dedication ensured the successful passing of all of the three audits. The independent auditors conducting the audits commented on the dedication of the employees and were extremely impressed that none of the 40,000 items were lost in the transfer of locations.

For providing an exceptional contribution to the progress of the department by performing their duties in an unusually effective manner Property and Evidence members Supervisor Rebecca Luna Agent Alan Shank, Property Technician Cynthia Camp, Property Technician Sean Dailey, Property Technician Sherrie Knodel, Property Technician Michael Mittleider, and Property Technician Ashley Oberg are hereby awarded the Aurora Police Department’s Chief’s Commendation.

**Lieutenant Marcus Dudley, Lieutenant Troy Edwards, Lieutenant Gary Millspaugh, Sergeant Chris Amsler, Officer Jennifer Krause, Officer Virgil Majors, Officer Crystal McCoy, Officer Darnesha Montgomery, Officer Amber Roberts, Crime Analyst Shawn Cooley**

In March of 2015, the Aurora Police Department through the Chief of Police, Nicholas Metz, identified a number of initiatives to enhance its relationship with the community. One such initiative was the designation of a Recruiting Strategies Committee (RSC) comprised of internal members and private
sector business partners working together to develop departmental recruiting strategies and approaches. The RSC was tasked with making recommendations to the Chief of Police, seeking not only to enhance the overall quality and quantity of applicants, but also to improve the diversification among applicants to build an organization that more closely mirrors Aurora’s multi-cultural community. The RSC was also tasked with identifying prospective community partners committed to forging strong public-private partnerships that could implement the recommendations. After nine months of collaboration, the RSC crafted a comprehensive report that will serve as the department’s recruiting blueprint for the foreseeable future and beyond.

For providing an exceptional contribution to the progress of the department by performing their duties in an unusually effective manner Lieutenant Marcus Dudley, Lieutenant Troy Edward, Lieutenant Gary Millspaugh, Sergeant Chris Amsler, Officer Jennifer Krause, Officer Virgil Majors, Officer Crystal McCoy, Officer Darnesha Montgomery, Officer Amber Roberts, and Crime Analyst Shawn Cooley were awarded the Aurora Police Department’s Chief’s Commendation.

**Sergeant Steven White**

In 2012, Sergeant Steve White put together an exploratory committee to see if it was possible to host the Colorado Police and Fire Games. He found that not only was it possible, but that we had hosted about 20 years ago. He formed a bid packet that included possible venues and hotels that were capable of hosting the event here in Aurora. He then presented that bid in front of the state Olympic Committee, which later voted on and approved them. As the games drew closer, he began to form another committee of people who had previously participated in the games or other large scale type activities. He appointed a game coordinator for each game. As there were several games that we could find no interest in, he ended up coordinating several sports by himself, including racquetball, volleyball, the 5k run and horseshoes. He coordinated with the city and obtained the necessary permissions and permits to hold the games at different venues across the city. These venues included the Beck Center, the APD Range, the Aurora Reservoir, the Aurora Sports Park, Murphy Creek Golf Course and Hinkley High School. He coordinated sponsorships which came in two forms: donations of money and donated goods and merchandise. This built a positive working relationship with local Aurora Businesses and provided a venue to showcase the City of Aurora to police and fire professionals from all over the region. After the games, money was donated to charities which directly benefited the City of Aurora Charities including Cops Fighting Cancer, the Special Olympics, and The Aurora Firefighters Benevolent Fund.

**Sergeant Barry Cape, Sergeant Seth Robertson, Officer Cory Budaj, Retired Officer Mel Cobb, Officer James Gentry, Officer Brandt Smith, Officer David Wilson**

On April 22, 2015 officers responded to 16250 E. 40th Ave. on a report of a possible hostage situation in a room on the 6th floor. The first arriving officers learned that a housekeeper was being held by a male who was on drugs. Realizing the potential harm to the employee, officers established an emergency arrest team and began to develop a rescue plan. Officer Mel Cobb set himself up in an adjoining room where he could attempt to listen to conversations and attempt contact with the male and victim. Officer Dan Iovine arrived shortly after and took position as the officer in charge of the rescue team. As more officers arrived the rescue team was adjusted to have Sergeant Barry Cape and Officer Mike Eli as breachers with Officer Iovine and Officer Seiwald as first to enter the room followed by Sergeant Mike
Holm. Due to the construction of the door, when breached, only the lower half broke off causing the initial officers to crawl through a hole in the door to make entry into the room. The male had choked the victim and was dragging her around the room threatening to throw her out a broken window. Members were given the order to execute the rescue. Officer Iovine and Officer Seiwald entered the room first and contacted the male who was in the process of assaulting the female, all four ended up on the floor where a violent fight ensued. Sergeant Holm was able to get the victim away from the suspect and pass her off to Officer Eli, who safely removed her from the room. Sergeant Carlson and Officer Tim Jeffrey tased the suspect; when that did not stop him from fighting, Officer Seiwald utilized the carotid control hold, at which time officers were able to handcuff the suspect and eventually place him in a hobble. Due to the quick actions of all officers involved and the rescue plan set up the hostage was rescued safely and the suspect arrested.

**Sergeant Craig Baumfalk, Sergeant Cassidee Carlson, Sergeant Claude Burns, Sergeant Michael Gaskill, Sergeant Joe Martinez, Sergeant Jason Paulovich, Sergeant Michael Pitrusu, Sergeant Stephen Redfearn (Since promoted to Lieutenant), Sergeant Scott Rutter, Sergeant Eric Scherr, Sergeant John Wilton, Officer Specialist Tomas Campagna, Officer Jason Chilson**

On November 14th, 2014 at around 9 p.m., Officer Ryan Burns and Officer Dale Leonard were riding as a two officer unit performing routine patrol duties. They initiated a traffic stop on a suspicious vehicle that unknown to them had just been stolen from E. 17th Ave. and Fulton St. Upon approaching the vehicle the driver of the car fired several shots at Officer Burns with a handgun. Officer Burns was struck in the right leg above the knee, inflicting severe life threatening injuries. Officer Leonard immediately returned fire in defense of Officer Burns and himself as the vehicle sped away. Officer Leonard observed that Officer Burns was severely wounded and was losing a significant amount of blood. Officer Leonard immediately applied a tourniquet to Officer Burns‘ leg to stop the bleeding. Officer Joseph Cornell arrived on scene and made the life saving decision to load Officer Burns into his patrol car and transport him to the ER at University Hospital rather than wait for rescue to arrive. Officer Burns was taken immediately into surgery, which lasted 6 plus hours. There is no question that the actions of both Officer Leonard by applying immediate first aid, and Officer Cornell’s decision to transport to the hospital, saved the life of Officer Burns.

Sergeant Craig Baumfalk and Officer T.J. Campagna stayed with Officer Burns for the duration of the surgery, reassuring him that he would be ok, and relaying information to his family and APD leadership to keep them constantly updated. The response and support to this incident was overwhelming, with close to two hundred officers arriving in the area, including DPD, to establish a perimeter, search for the suspect, and set up command operations. The actions of all officers, dispatchers, and civilians involved were vital to the overall mission, investigation, and later successful prosecution.

For successful management of a complex scene involving hundreds of responders in addition to a successful follow up investigation and prosecution of the offenders in this case, Sergeant Craig Baumfalk, Sergeant Cassidee Carlson, Sergeant Claude Burns, Sergeant Michael Gaskill, Sergeant Joe Martinez, Sergeant Jason Paulovich, Sergeant Michael Pitrusu, Sergeant Stephen Redfearn, Sergeant Scott Rutter, Sergeant Eric Scherr, Sergeant John Wilton, Officer Specialist Tomas Campagna, and Officer Jason Chilson are hereby awarded with the Aurora Police Department’s Chief’s Commendation Certificate.
Officer James Giordano and Officer Tim King, Detective Casey Williams, Lieutenant Dan Mark, Sergeant Steve Redfearn, Records Technician Dan Akin, Denver Detective Joseph Delmonico, Denver Detective Joseph Trujillo

An unknown suspect started a series of robberies in several jurisdictions to include Aurora, Denver, and Commerce City. The suspect was violent, unpredictable and attacked two of his victims with the knife he used during the robberies. Agent Casey Williams was assigned the case and put out timely bulletins and communicated regularly with Denver Detectives (Detectives Delmonico and Trujillo) assigned to the Denver robbery cases. On May 13th, 2015 at 1350, the suspect, Ian Griggs, robbed the Subway located at 1470 Chambers Road. Shortly after the robbery was aired, Denver Detectives Delmonico and Trujillo provided information to Aurora Detectives that they had received from an informant. The information provided a moniker for the suspect, the type of vehicle he was driving, the State the vehicle was registered in and where he would most likely go after a robbery. That information was relayed to Detective Williams, who transmitted it to responding officers by radio and he also put out emails. Records Technician Akin was monitoring the emails providing immediate feedback with information about the suspect vehicle and possible driver, which included a Missouri DL photo. Lt. Dan Mark took the information about the vehicle from the email and located the vehicle through the LPR system. Lt. Mark was able to identify the license plate number of the vehicle and even provided a clear still image of the driver operating the suspect vehicle that looked like the suspect in the robbery videos. Sergeant Redfearn located the vehicle via LPR going through the Havana and Colfax readers shortly after the Subway robbery and provided that information and the image of the vehicle to patrol. Officer King located the suspect vehicle at 14th and Tamarac Street and was able to follow it. Once the vehicle had stopped, Officer King was able to block the car from the front. Officer Giordano located Denver Patrol Officers in the area and with Officer King was able to block the suspect vehicle into its parked position and the suspect was taken into custody without incident. A total of 13 robberies in 3 jurisdictions were cleared with the arrest of Ian Griggs. Two of those robberies also included the attempted murder of the victims. The teamwork involved in this incident is what is truly impressive. The responsiveness of the officers and technician who took the information they received without being asked or instructed, made a valuable contribution to the identification and apprehension of a very dangerous criminal. From the time the information was received, it only took approximately 40 minutes to locate the suspect and arrest him.

Officer Salvatore Fazio

On May 5th, 2014, the Law Enforcement Support Office (LESO), with the Department of Defense-Defense Logistics Agency, conducted an audit of all the Aurora Police Department’s 1033 program rifles. The auditors are flown in from Battle Creek, Michigan and are accompanied by the state coordinator for the program. These auditors conduct numerous inspections of agencies all across the United States. APD currently has 151 1033 program rifles in its inventory, the second highest in the state. Officer Salvatore “Sam” Fazio, currently assigned to the APD Range, is tasked with monitoring the 1033 program rifles. He has created an extremely organized system for accounting for the rifles, to include a “check out card” which has a photo of each rifle’s serial number and a photo of the officer who signs for it. He also keeps a record book up to date on a constant basis and works diligently to make sure all information is correct. The audit was completed in less than an hour without bringing any of the assigned rifles to the Range.
The auditors commented that the forms with photos were “perfect” and took a copy of the form to members of LESO as an example of the ideal signature card and record keeping system for the program. Officer Fazio is commended for his excellent record maintenance and innovation of the checkout cards. His contribution to the efficiency of the Department will be adopted not only by the APD Range unit, but by other outside law enforcement agencies that participate in the 1033 program rifle program. For taking initiative and setting the example for others to follow, Officer Salvatore “Sam” Fazio, is hereby awarded the Chief’s Commendation Certificate.

**Officer Timothy Jeffrey**

In the fall of 2013, Officer Tim Jeffrey and Chief Rob McGregor had a conversation about reaching a younger demographic to include in the Department’s already successful Citizen’s Police Academy Program. Chief McGregor challenged Tim to come up with a program directed at the youth in the community, essentially a Teen Citizen’s Police Academy (TCPA). While apprehensive about taking on the commitment of such a program, along with his regular PAR duties, Tim accepted the challenge. During the winter and spring months to follow, Tim began working on the program to develop a schedule, curriculum and coordinate logistics such as location and supplies. Tim’s goal was to design a dynamic and interesting program directed at a comprehensive informational curriculum, while keeping the attention of teens, ages 14 to 17. Working with upwards of 30 members of the department, along with coordinating with outside agencies such as the Denver Police Department, Tim’s vision began to take shape. Working almost 200 hours, both on and off duty, the final outcome was a 2 week, 45 hour program that would expose teens to driving a police car, getting bitten by a K-9, crime scene investigations, along with tours of the Jail, Headquarters, and Municipal Courts. They would also participate in shoot, don’t shoot scenarios at the Academy simulator, learn how to make safe traffic stops, and a wide variety of other law enforcement topics. Tim formed a TCPA support staff, consisting of five SROs and one volunteer officer. To recruit and promote the program, Tim visited local High Schools, giving presentations on the benefits of attending. He also partnered with the department’s Media Relations Unit/PIO to use social media as a recruitment tool. Due to Tim’s initiative, hard work, and dedication, the Aurora Police Department now has a successful Teen Citizen’s Police Academy, with the first class graduating the program on June 28th, 2014.

**Administrative Specialist Ruth Brassell**

In June of 2014, the Aurora Police Department hosted its very first “Teen Citizen Police Academy” which was attended by over 50 area youth between the ages of 15 and 18 years old. This program was modeled after the effective and popular Citizen’s and Senior Citizen’s Police Academies which have been sponsored and taught by APD personnel for approximately 25 years. Throughout the design and implementation of this new teen program, Administrative Specialist Ruth Brassell willingly and enthusiastically agreed to assist in any way possible in order to ensure the success of the new program. Ruth conducted and implemented a cost analysis, coordinated the logistics, ordering, shipping and delivery of supplies, made name badges, oversaw the design of graphics for application and flyers, distributed the flyers, handled all the incoming applications, had personal telephone contact with the applicants and their families, handled background investigations in order to ensure a “proper fit” for the participants, organized the curriculum binders, made follow up calls for “no-shows” and organized the two separate graduation ceremonies amongst other endless tasks. In short, because of Ruth’s
enthusiastic and professional efforts, the inaugural launch of the APD Teen Citizen Police Academy was deemed a great success.

**Crime Analyst Mary Smith, Administrative Specialist Kathy Payne, and Elizabeth Golden (Volunteer)**

In early 2014, the Aurora Town Center retail shopping district faced sharply rising shoplifting occurrences. Pattern offenders targeted these businesses due to what was perceived as a revolving door, and an ineffective justice system facing pattern criminals. Traditional policing and prosecutorial efforts were failing in addressing this criminal activity. Members of the APD District Two PAR Team met to address and solve this problem. Through an open-ended series of brainstorming sessions, followed up by hard staff work, a model program was developed. Stake holder buy-in from affected retailers was sought out and obtained. Judicial buy in was secured from the City Attorney’s Office, and then from the Chief Magistrate of the Municipal Court. Systems were developed to track repeat and chronic shoplifting offenders. Innovative approaches included mandatory arrests for second-further offenders, and mandatory overnight jailing of offenders with next day court arraignments. All offenders were screened for prior offenses. Items used in furthering criminal activity (vehicles, personal possessions, etc.) were seized as potential nuisance items. A school age educational video was scripted with Aurora Public School drama team assistance, and is being shown to all schools in this large urban community. Text templates were developed to streamline warrantless arrest affidavits, and chronic offenders were flagged in police records for instant identification. Chronic shoplifters were issued trespass notices by impacted businesses. The additional workload would have overwhelmed already short staffed patrol officers. So the District Two PAR Officers altered their work schedules including duty hours and days off to support this pilot program.

As a result of their ideas, staff work, dedication to the citizens of Aurora, and superb teamwork, shoplifting fell 33% in six months. Equally important, overall crime fell 60% in the pilot area. Feedback from offenders is that they are avoiding Aurora Town Center and participating businesses due to this problem oriented policing approach to pattern crime. Other law enforcement agencies are adopting this program due to the demonstrated effectiveness. The program is now being adopted citywide and has received acclaim, emulation from several other law enforcement agencies in Colorado.

**Sergeant Kevin Kenney, Officer Melissa Shipley, Officer Rebecca Yockey, Officer Danno Singleton, Officer Scott Osgood, Officer Richard Grooms**

In May of 2014, Officers Melissa Harden, Rebecca Yockey, Danno Singleton, Douglas Rystrom, Scott Osgood and Richard Grooms were assigned to the Property and Evidence Unit. These officers were detailed to the unit to assist regular staff in dealing with the crushing backlog and re-organization efforts that the department was undertaking. Even though not one of the officers had ever dealt with these issues before they quickly determined the most pressing issues and formulated a strategic plan to relabel, scan, inventory and organize tens of thousands of evidentiary items. Each day was spent searching through hundreds of dust covered boxes of articles. Each box contained anywhere from ten to several hundred cases. Through time the barcode labels had faded and these officers had to manually look up each item in each and every case before printing and attaching new individual labels. In order to spell themselves from the tedium of this task for a brief period, these officers ended up rearranging hundreds of additional boxes of evidence. They moved them from adjacent warehouse aisles up and down numerous flights of stairs and hallways to different buildings. Their dedication was spectacular and their dedication to accomplishing this effort was unwavering. In fact, several officers even
requested to be assigned to the unit to continue forward with projects that they had initiated. By the time these officers were rotated back to their regular assignments they had sorted through, relabeled, scanned, inventoried and reorganized over fifty thousand evidentiary items and many hundreds of boxes of evidence. Rooms at the property warehouse were completely transformed into showpiece examples. These same officers reorganized better paths for the unit to follow, seized the initiative and tremendously impacted the manner in which we store our police evidence now and in the future.

**Administrative Specialist Lisa McKown, Administrative Specialist Deborah Burgess**

Administrative Specialists Deborah Burgess and Lisa McKown are responsible for issuing court subpoenas and processing court overtime slips for hundreds of sworn officers every day. Deborah and Lisa noticed that an inordinate amount of court overtime slips were being submitted and processed, even though the officers’ were not testifying in Municipal Court. Deborah and Lisa formulated a plan and developed a new court overtime slip to capture the necessary information to determine if officers needed to be subpoenaed and if their testimony was indeed needed. Data was captured that indicated many officers’ were not needed for testimony, but an estimated $30,000.00 was spent on court overtime unnecessarily over a three month period. This information was submitted to city management with details on how the Court Liaison Office could assist the Municipal Courts and the Aurora City Attorney’s Office better manage the number of officers that needed to be subpoenaed for testimony, and help eliminate those that were not. This plan that is under consideration by City Management would save the city thousands of dollars, increase the administrative and operational efficiency of the Department, and improve the quality of life for the officers, especially those working night shifts.

**Officer Thomas Eckstadt**

On March 1, 2014 at about 1340 hours dispatch aired a call of an assist for the Denver Police Department. Denver Detectives and Fugitive Unit Officers were attempting to apprehend a double homicide suspect in the area of East Mississippi Ave. and South Chambers Rd. Officer Chris Eckstadt responded to the area and DPD Officers aired that the suspect vehicle was now eastbound on Mississippi Ave. The vehicle then turned north on Kalispell St. Officer Eckstadt was directly behind the DPD Officers who were following the suspect. The suspect vehicle stopped in front of 1020 S. Kalispell St and he observed 3 young males exit the vehicle and start running away. He chased one of them into the backyard of the house. He witnessed this party with what appeared to be a gun in his hand and the party was wrapping it with a small towel or doo-rag. Officer Eckstadt yelled orders for the party to drop the weapon and get on the ground and they he disregarded his orders and continued running. All suspects were ultimately arrested, including the double homicide suspect. Officer Eckstadt is commended for his courage and bravery as well as his show of reserve in not firing his weapon at what he believed was a fleeing homicide suspect with a weapon that did not respond to his orders. Officer Eckstadt performed exceptionally in this quickly evolving, chaotic circumstance and is commended for his actions.

**Officer Todd Arntson**

On January 10, 2015, at approximately 0410 hours, Officer Todd Arntson assisted Sgt. Holt with a traffic stop in the area of E. 11th Ave. and Havana St. The vehicle had failed to stop at two red lights. Due to the time of night, the location of the stop, and the actions of the vehicle, it was unclear if the vehicle was stolen or possibly involved in another crime in the area. A male passenger in the vehicle fled on
foot as soon as the vehicle came to a stop, suggesting it was more than just a traffic stop. As the subject was running, he kept his right arm by his side, possibly holding or reaching for a weapon. As Officer Arntson got close to the subject, the subject swung at Officer Arntson in an attempt to strike him. Officer Arntson deployed his taser and the subject dropped an item on the ground. The subject continued to run and was tackled and tased again by Officer Arntson. After an intense struggle, the subject was taken into custody. He had a loaded .22 caliber revolver in his pocket. When the area was checked for the item that was dropped by the subject, a fully loaded MAC 11 machine pistol with a 30 round magazine and 1 round in the chamber was recovered. During a search of the subject, drugs were found on his person and he was later found to be a previous offender.

ARAPCO DA Dan Seidel and ARAPCO DA Mike Angel
In 2012 the City of Aurora experienced an escalation in violent gang on gang crimes. The crimes were tied to two different gangs, the Rollin 60’s and the 83 Gangster Crips. Sergeant Mike Gaskill, Agent Mike Thrapp and Officer Kevin Rossi partnered with the Arapahoe County District Attorney’s office, Mike Angel and Daniel Seidel to begin a grand jury case against the Rollin 60’s in order to reduce this escalation of violence. The Rollin 60’s were first documented in Los Angeles, California in the 1970’s and became notorious for their violence. The Rollin 60’s spread to Aurora in the 1980’s and continue their presence today. The subsequent two year investigation by the Aurora Police Department’s Gang Investigation Unit, the 18th Judicial District Attorney’s Office and the Federal Bureau of Investigations Rocky Mountain Safe Street Task Force resulted in a 73 count indictment and the arrest of 25 members and associates of the Rollin 60’s street gang. The primary indictments consisted of shootings, assaults and robberies. The Rollin 60’s focus on stranger robberies with a showing of force through weapons and/or numbers or drug related robberies, again through the use of force and numbers. In addition many members of the gang committed burglaries with the goal of obtaining guns to sell back to the gang. The Rollin 60’s also engaged in violent and assaultive conduct to increase their reputation within the greater community. The hard work and dedication of everyone involved in this case resulted in a substantial impact on the Rollin 60’s and their ability to negatively impact the community. This cooperative, complex investigation against a violent street gang benefited the entire community and can be used as a model for future investigations and prosecutions.

Officer Kevin Deichsel
On May 6, 2013, a drunk driver turned left in front of an on-coming motorcycle. This resulted in a crash that took the life of the motorcycle rider, who was an off-duty Littleton Police Officer. Officer Kevin Deichsel was called to respond to the crash. He conducted field sobriety tests on the suspect and led the physical examination and subsequent reconstruction of the crash. As a result of the investigation, the suspect was charged with Vehicular Homicide. In preparing for trial, the District Attorney's office was so impressed with Ofc. Deichsel's work that they chose him to be the advisory officer for the case. Officer Deichsel put in numerous hours of preparation for the prosecution of this case. When he was given the defense experts report the weekend before trial, he took his own time to thoroughly examine the report and found multiple inaccuracies which the prosecution was able to exploit at trial. As a result of his work, testimony and expertise, the defendant was found guilty of Vehicular Homicide by the jury in two and a half hours of deliberation. On March 31, 2015, Judge Marshall sentenced the defendant to the maximum of 12 years in prison followed by five years probation.
Agent Richard Hefty and Denver DA Ralph Stevenson
Detective Richard Hefty was assigned a robbery case where an at-risk elderly adult was robbed of $150,000 cash. The suspect approached the victim in a parking lot claiming to have money from Africa to share. The suspect said he needed to see earnest money from the victim. The victim brought out a suitcase containing $150,000 cash. The suspect assaulted the victim and ran off with the money. The only evidence we had initially was poor quality video of the incident, we were able to identify a black Volvo station wagon. Detective Hefty had a bulletin created with still images of the vehicle and suspects. A Denver Officer responded to the bulletin, identifying the driver and his female passenger. It was later discovered that the suspects that did our robbery had also committed several frauds in Aurora using this same scam and 6 more in Denver, for a total loss exceeding $200,000. Detective Hefty worked closely with Detectives at Denver P.D. and the Denver DA's office to compile information about the suspects and their crimes. It was discovered that the suspect driving the black Volvo was on parole and living in a halfway house. Detective Hefty worked with Denver DA Investigator Ralph Stevenson and the suspect's Parole Officer. Both of the male suspects were taken into custody shortly after being identified, halting their crime spree. Detective Hefty, in conjunction with Denver DA Investigator Ralph Stevenson, researched the two male suspects and found out that they were cellmates in prison. Detective Hefty and Investigator Stephenson were able to get a confession from one of the suspects who also gave up the location of the stolen money, which belonged to at-risk elderly adults. Detective Hefty and Investigator Stephenson worked days-off and extended work days to investigate and close these cases. Their efforts and the recovery of this money exemplifies excellent customer service and dedication. Rich took over a multi-case, multi-jurisdiction and extremely complex investigation. He worked tirelessly and in cooperation with a Denver DAs Office investigator to bring justice to our most vulnerable citizens.

Agent Randy Hansen
On November 4, 2013, Detective Randy Hansen was working in the Innocence Lost Task Force through Safe Streets. The unit’s primary function was to investigate Human Trafficking. On this date, patrol Officers responded to a call from the father of a 17 year old female wanting to report to the police that he had noticed a change in his daughter’s behavior. Hoping to find something that would help explain this change, the father had a look through the daughter’s cell phone. On her cell phone he observed text messages and photographs that were sexual in nature. The daughter confessed to her dad that she had been working as a prostitute for a pimp at a local hotel in Aurora. The Crimes Against Children unit contacted Detective Hansen who began looking into the allegations. Detective Hansen learned that a female was recruiting girls for a pimp through advertisements placed on websites. He later learned that the pimp went by the name of “Tennessee”, and that he conducted a majority of his business in Aurora. Detective Hansen learned that “Tennessee” had a photographer take pictures of the girls in their underwear and post them on various websites for escort services. He wrote several search warrants and arrest warrants that helped bring down an elaborate Human Trafficking ring.
Sergeant Kevin Kenney, Lieutenant James Lesnansky, Sergeant Pat Smith

In June of 2013, the Aurora Police Department discovered that there was a distinct possibility that DNA evidence in over 450 cases had been potentially and prematurely destroyed. As a result, five experts from the law enforcement community were empaneled by the Chief of Police to review any and all of the DNA cases that had been destroyed. It took over an entire year to analyze the complex and extensive material. The committee had to review each and every case on its own merit and then make a determination as far as impacts were concerned. It should be pointed out that Sgt. Kenney of the Property and Evidence Unit, took on the task of reviewing all of the cases in addition to receiving some assistance from other members of the department. Sergeant Kenney worked tirelessly during that year to bring information forward that would shed light on how and why the evidence was destroyed. Without the assistance of Sergeant Kenney, this process could not have been accomplished successfully. Ultimately, the department was able to write up a comprehensive DNA report in which it was determined that only two cases of notability were impacted. Although sad in the outcome of finding two sexual assault cases in which DNA had been destroyed, without Sergeant Kenney’s tenacity, and attention to detail this matter could not have been resolved successfully.

Agent Carrigan Bennett

Over the past number of years, Agent Carrigan Bennett has become the resident expert in providing assistance to the APD Awards Board in preparing and planning the annual APD Awards Ceremony presentation, which is held each May to recognize the heroic and notable accomplishments of our officers. Agent Bennett, although saddled with a number of other responsibilities, takes the time, energy and effort, along with his wife Eleanor, to put together a very well organized and thought out awards ceremony presentation. The Aurora Police Department is set apart from other agencies locally because of the professionalism in which their awards ceremony is conducted. It is in no short order that Agent Bennett provides expertise, technical support, and an overall excellent presentation for the awards in which officers are honored and recognized. It is with heartfelt gratitude and thanks that the Aurora Police Department bestows the Chief’s Commendation Certificate to Agent Carrigan Bennett (and in part to his wife, Eleanor, for her narration and voice over capabilities). Thank you for making the awards ceremony a notable experience for all those that attend, past, present, and future.

Officer Randall Ricks, Officer Eugene Vandyk, and Officer Cassie Schell

From February 2014 through January 2015 Officers Randall Ricks, Eugene VanDyk and Cassie Schell have regularly engaged in targeted enforcement actions aimed at contacting gang members and other felons. Through self-initiated field activities, information developed from dispatched calls for service and intelligence gathered from roll call items as well as other officers and field contacts, these officers have confiscated or seized 18 fire arms and 2 illegal weapons. These activities have resulted in numerous felony case filings in District and Federal courts. These activities have been conducted in addition to regular patrol officer duties, there have been repeated occasions where their peers and supervisors specifically request their assistance in these endeavors. These activities have a heightened level of danger to these officers due to the very nature of the contacts involving weapons and that the persons they have contacted, identified and arrested have a vested interest in avoiding contact with law-enforcement due to gang allegiances and criminal activities they routinely engage in. Further noted is that these
enforcement activities involve interviews with suspects that often do not want to cooperate with the police. These investigations require a high degree of technical knowledge in applicable search and seizure laws and the processing and classification of firearms for nationwide identification and linking to other crimes. These activities have made the City of Aurora a safer place for citizens to reside and have undoubtedly prevented the use of these weapons in crimes of violence.

**Retired Officer John Daniel, Retired Officer John Brungardt**
Officer John Daniel and Officer John Brungardt retired from the Aurora Police Department several years ago and have remained active as volunteers with the department. Officer Daniel and Officer Brungardt are known for the special keepsake batons that they beautifully craft themselves for retired APD officers. Additionally, Officer Daniel volunteers his time with the K-9 unit and has maintained the K-9 cemetery at the range for over 15 years. Officer John Daniel is being recognized for his many years of selfless dedication in supporting the officers of the Aurora Police Department in such a meaningful way. Retired Officer John Daniel is hereby awarded the Chief's Commendation Certificate.

**Officer Daniel Southwick**
On June 13, 2015, an aggravated robbery occurred at the Bottle Shop Liquor store at 876 S. Havana Street. A female pulled a knife out on the store employee after being confronted during a theft of liquor. Detective Schnicke requested assistance from PAR Officer Dan Southwick to help identify the suspects. Officer Southwick has a great rapport with many citizens and extensive knowledge of his area. Without hesitation, Officer Southwick agreed to help. He located a homeless person named Carl, whom he knows to frequent the liquor store, Carl provided several leads that helped the investigation. Officer Southwick followed the leads that resulted in the positive identification of the suspect through a photo line-up. Without Officer Southwick having extensive knowledge of his area and maintaining a great rapport with the citizens, regardless of their circumstances, this case may not have been solved. Officer Southwick's willingness to assist at a moments notice has always been a positive attribute he exemplifies. This is just another example of Officer Southwick's commitment to always doing an outstanding job.
Chief’s Unit Citation

The Chief’s Unit Citation may be awarded by the Chief of Police to an entire unit whose members perform their assigned duties in an unusually effective manner. The Chief of Police may recognize units comprised of officers from the Aurora Police Department as well as other organizations, or multi-jurisdictional task forces, for this award.

The department presented nine (9) Chief’s Unit Citations in 2015.

Aurora Police Explorer Advisors: Sergeant Sue Baker, Agent Reginald DePass, Agent Johnny Lee, Officer Emily Buchan, Officer Amber Buck Roberts, Officer Natasha Cabouet, Officer Stephen Cary, Officer Craig Collins, Officer Diana Cooley, Officer Ken Forrest, Officer Bill Hummel, Officer Jeremy J. Jenkins, Officer Jennifer Krause, Officer Paul McClendon, Officer Darnesha Montgomery, Officer Fermin Moreno, Officer Tom Muldoon, Officer Danno Singleton, Officer Dan Smick, Officer Mike Stricklin and University of Colorado Officer Bret Rhoades

The Aurora Police Explorer Advisors are a special breed! In addition to their normal full time duties, court and late calls, they devote many hours to our 50 plus Police Explorers. Advisors train, mentor, and counsel, along with maintaining equipment, uniforms, vehicles, and scheduling and recruiting events. Our Advisors go above and beyond, such as buying food out of their own pockets, writing reference letters, and being available for problems that arise 24/7. Our Advisors are great role models and advise and encourage our Explorers for any career or goal they may be pursuing. Due to their outstanding professionalism and dedication to duty, they are shaping our future leaders!

For their dedication and selfless service, the Aurora Police Explorers Advisors were award the Chief’s Unit Citation.

Emergency Response Team

From May 29th through the 31st of 2015, the Rocky Mountain Airshow came to Aurora and was hosted at the Aurora Reservoir. This event attracted multiple international and national air show acts, including the United States Air Force “Thunderbirds.” The Aurora Police Department representatives were involved in the planning aspects of this multi-day event, and logistics were coordinated amongst several APD units. The Emergency Response Team was tasked with designing and implementing a comprehensive security plan for the inside of the venue, to include coordination with other local, state and federal partners to ensure site security for promoters, vendors, visitors and dignitaries. Members of the Emergency Response Team were assigned various duties during the duration of this event, and worked tirelessly in a multitude of weather and crowd conditions. At one point during the event, it became apparent that the resources of an outside vendor became overwhelmed with parking and traffic control issues. The members of the Emergency Response Team recognized these issues, and instantly stepped in to coordinate and control the large volume of vehicular and pedestrian traffic that was entering into the venue. Even though this was not their assigned duty, members worked in a professional and tireless fashion, some for up to eight hours in the hot sun and dusty environment, all the while being subjected to less than hospitable patrons. Additionally, at the culmination of the airshow, ERT members stepped in and provided first aid and basic life-supporting measures to several attendees who fell ill all at once. Throughout the event, members of the public and event organizers
praised the members of the Emergency Response Team for their professionalism, extreme sense of duty, friendliness and professionalism while assigned to the 2015 Rocky Mountain Airshow.

In light of their service, sacrifice and commitment, the Aurora Police Department’s Emergency Response Team was awarded the Chief’s Unit Citation.

Media Relations Unit
Lieutenant Marcus Dudley, Sergeant Chris Amsler, Officer Diana Cooley, Officer Crystal McCoy

For most of 2015 and all of 2016, the Aurora Police Department has seen significant changes, challenges, opportunities and growth. These include, but certainly not limited to; a new Chief of Police, new department organizational structure, new Senior Command Staff, updated policies and procedures, new technology, high profile incidents, reinforced strategies on community outreach, crime and other public safety challenges. There is one unit that has been, and continues to be, directly involved and impacted by each of the above listed...that is our Public Information Office. Many might assume that the role of the PIO is easy and glamorous. Most do not get to see the amount of work these folks do seven days a week. The demands of ensuring timely communication to the media, community, and especially internal to the department, is daunting and often overwhelming. Their use of various social media mediums (Twitter, Next Door, Periscope, Facebook, Instagram, APD Website, and others) does so much in getting our story out when mainstream media may, at first, lack interest. They are proactive in identifying the true character, role and activities of APD. They do an excellent job in getting out those positive news stories about the great things our employees do each day. They also do a great job of setting the story straight when inaccurate information is disseminated by the media. This is critical to balancing out what often seems to be negative portrayals of police in today’s climate. Educating our local reporters about what we do, and just as important, what we don’t do, is also very important. Our PIO’s have done an excellent job in developing respectful and professional rapport with many local reporters. This has often helped in getting positive, or at least balanced, news coverage. The image of the APD is often in their care and they take that responsibility personally.

In light of their service, sacrifice, and commitment, the Aurora Police Department’s Public Information Officer was awarded the Chief’s Unit Citation

Property and Evidence Unit – Property Technician Mike Mittleider, Property Technician Rebecca Luna, Property Technician Sherrie Knodel, and Property Technician Stephanie Evan

Since June of 2013 when the Aurora Police Department’s Property and Evidence Unit learned that DNA evidence had been inadvertently destroyed, Property Technicians Rebecca Luna, Sherrie Knodel, Mike Mittleider and Stephanie Evans went to work towards providing a more effective and accountable process for the members of the Aurora Police Department. Rebecca, Sherrie, Mike and Stephanie have worked towards making the Property and Evidence Unit more productive by helping to reorganize the Property and Evidence Unit at all four storage locations. Due to their teamwork and efforts they saved the City of Aurora several thousands of dollars by providing the manual labor to tear down and assemble new shelves and pallet racking system at the storage locations. They are also completing the first ever audit of over 400,000 items that are stored in the Property and Evidence Unit. They all learned new computer programs, suggested and helped institute new efficient processes in the way the unit intakes, stores and destroys evidence and property. They have also tested a new program on the
continuity of evidence so the locations of items are known from the time it is retrieved from the evidence locker until it is disposed. They are currently implementing the direct evidence program in Versadex to work out the bugs prior to the officers using the program. Once this direct entry program is instituted it will allow officers to cease completing duplicate work, allow them to itemize the property and evidence more quickly, and get them back on the road faster. They have also tested and improved the property intake module allowing for a more efficient way to intake, store and locate property. Rebecca, Sherrie, Mike and Stephanie have done this all while being understaffed and doing their daily assignments and tasks. APD Property Unit Technicians’ Stephanie Evans, Sherrie Knodel, Rebecca Luna, and Mike Mittlieder are commended for providing such an exceptional contribution to the progress of the department and performing their duties as a team in an unusually effective manner.

**Fugitive Apprehension & Surveillance Team (FAST)**
Officer Eric Bond, Officer John Campbell, Officer James Giordano, Officer Richard Hirtle, Officer Emily Hitchings, Officer Tim King, Officer Tony Martinez, Officer Andrea Scales, Agent Mike Thrapp, Agent Chris Fanning, Agent Randy Hansen

Teamwork is essential to any law enforcement agency, as is is the foundation that is required to accomplish our overall mission. The Fugitive Apprehension and Surveillance Team (FAST) is no exception. FAST consists of two Agents and eight officers. Three of which work out of the Safe Streets Task Force in Bank Robbery, Innocence Lost and the Fugitive; one officer works out of the City Attorney’s Office; and six core officers work the fugitive unit for the department. Each member was chosen for this position through a highly selective process. Every individual on this team is essential to the success of the Aurora Police Department and the safety of its citizens. The FAST team is a selfless group who are undeniably dedicated to working with one another in different capacities but with the same goal in mind; getting the worst of the worst off of the streets. They remain humble in their roles with little time to reflect on past captures or investigations. FAST members are an incredibly committed and motivated team who often work their regularly scheduled shifts in addition to countless hours of overtime; midnight phone calls from confidential sources; and weekend pick-ups. They are quick to downplay what it is they have most recently accomplished and even quicker to dive into their next assignments. This team exemplifies that no one is safe from arrest when FAST is looking for them. Since 2012, the team has not only demostrated their ability to find anyone anywhere, but their arrest numbers have increased year after year. The team has had great success tracking some of the most dangerous wanted parties across the United States and other countries. This could not have been accomplished without the positive working relationships that have been cultivated by members of the unit with outside agencies. A testament to the hard work and dedication the FAST team has employed during the last four years.

**Traffic Section DUI Team**
Officer Ryan Marker, Officer Rolando Gomez, and Officer Jason Chilson

On March 31, 2012, the Aurora Police Department Traffic Section DUI Team was formed. The team, composed of its original members, Officer Jason Chilson, Officer Rolando Gomez, and Officer Ryan Marker, have been relentless in their efforts, arresting to date a total of 3,649 DUI/DUI-D impaired and dangerous drivers. They have been recognized with multiple awards from the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT), Mothers’ Against Drunk Drivers’ (MADD), along with praise from Arapahoe, Douglas, and Adams County District Attorney’s Offices’ for their passion and dedication in removing impaired drivers off Aurora’s roadways. Since its inception, the DUI teams’ hard work has made a
significant impact be reducing of alcohol & drug related serious bodily injury and fatal crashes. Their presence on the road also motivates other patrol officers to actively seek out and stop impaired driver’s as they all know the DUI team will be there to assist and take over the time consuming investigation when requested, so they can attend to other priorities and calls for service.

Teen Police Academy Staff
Officer Aaron Bunch, Officer Rebecca Yockey, Officer Jackie Campbell, Officer Melissa Shipley, Officer Bridget Johnson, Officer Carolyn Renaud, and Officer Danno Singleton
In June of 2014, the Aurora Police Department hosted its very first “Teen Citizen Police Academy” which was attended by over 50 area youth between the ages of 15 and 18 years old. This program was modeled after the effective and popular Citizen’s and Senior Citizen’s Police Academies which have been sponsored and taught by APD personnel for approximately 25 years. Organizationally there are many people “behind the scenes” who are to be commended for their efforts involving this program: Officer Tim Jeffrey for conceptualizing and bringing this program to fruition, Sgt. Shelly Owens for her help and involvement in promoting the concept, Mrs. Ruth Brassell for her organization skills and efforts and invaluable assistance in the implementation process, and the following officers for their spirit and desire to work with the youth of our community and to serve as a volunteer. “Teen Citizen Police Academy” staff members: Officer Aaron “Jake” Bunch, Officer Jackie Campbell, Officer Melissa Harden, Officer Bridget Johnson, Officer C. J. Renaud, Officer Danno Singleton and Officer Rebecca Yockey. All of your actions and efforts combined for a very successful and popular youth program which not only was enjoyed by all who attended, but which has also brought positive National recognition to the Aurora Police Department as well as the City of Aurora, Colorado. Thank you for you continued commitment to the youth of our city and surrounding communities.

Gang Intervention Unit – Rollin’ 60’s Indictments
Sergeant Mike Gaskill, Acting Sergeant Phil Rathbun, Agent Pete Szuch, Agent Mike Thrapp, Agent Pete Page, Agent Nate Meier, Officer Jonathan McCants, Officer Brent Maksyn, Officer Jonathan Dennis, Officer Stewart Brought, Officer Doug Pearson, Officer Kevin Rossi
In 2012 the City of Aurora experienced an escalation in violent gang on gang crimes. The crimes were tied to two different gangs, the Rollin 60’s and the 83 Gangster Crips. Sergeant Mike Gaskill, Agent Mike Thrapp and Officer Kevin Rossi partnered with the Arapahoe County District Attorney’s office, Mike Angel and Daniel Seidel to begin a grand jury case against the Rollin 60’s in order to reduce this escalation of violence. The Rollin 60’s were first documented in Los Angeles, California in the 1970’s and became notorious for their violence. The Rollin 60’s spread to Aurora in the 1980’s and continue their presence today. The subsequent two year investigation by the Aurora Police Department’s Gang Intervention Unit, the 18th Judicial District Attorney’s Office and the Federal Bureau of Investigations Rocky Mountain Safe Street Task Force, resulted in a 73 count indictment and the arrest of 25 members and associates of the Rollin 60’s street gang. The primary indictments consisted of shootings, assaults and robberies. The Rollin 60’s focus was on stranger robberies with a show of force through weapons and/or numbers, and or drug related robberies. In addition many members of the gang committed burglaries with the goal of obtaining guns to sell back to the gang. The Rollin 60’s also engaged in violent and assaultive conduct to increase their reputation within the greater community. The hard work and dedication of everyone involved in this case resulted in a substantial impact on the Rollin 60’s and their ability to negatively impact the community. This cooperative, complex investigation against a
violent street gang benefited the entire community and can be used as a model for future investigations and prosecutions.

**District 2 PAR Team – Shoplifter Program**

**Sergeant Mike Hanifin, Officer Nicole Weiffenbach, Officer Tim Jeffrey, Officer Mike Dziurgot, Officer Candice Iovine, Officer Dan Iovine, Officer Diana Cooley, Officer Jason McIrvin, Officer Jay Van Kam**

In early 2014, the Aurora Town Center retail shopping district faced sharply rising shoplifting occurrences. Pattern offenders targeted these businesses due to what was perceived as a revolving door, and an ineffective justice system facing pattern criminals. Traditional policing and prosecutorial efforts were failing in addressing this criminal activity. Members of the APD District Two PAR Team met to address and solve this problem. Through an open-ended series of brainstorming sessions, followed up by hard staff work, a model program was developed. Stakeholder buy-in from affected retailers was sought out and obtained. Judicial buy-in was secured from the City Attorney’s Office, and then from the Chief Magistrate of the Municipal Court. Systems were developed to track repeat and chronic shoplifting offenders. Innovative approaches included mandatory arrests for second-further offenders, and mandatory overnight jailing of offenders with next day court arraignments. All offenders were screened for prior offenses. Items used in furthering criminal activity (vehicles, personal possessions, etc.) were seized as potential nuisance items. A school age educational video was scripted with Aurora Public School drama team assistance, and is being shown to all schools in this large urban community. Text templates were developed to streamline warrantless arrest affidavits, and chronic offenders were flagged in police records for instant identification. Chronic shoplifters were issued trespass notices by impacted businesses.

The additional workload would have overwhelmed already short staffed patrol officers. So the District Two PAR Officers altered their work schedules including duty hours and days off to support this pilot program. As a result of their ideas, staff work, dedication to the citizens of Aurora, and superb teamwork, shoplifting fell 33% in six months. Equally important, overall crime fell 60% in the pilot area. Feedback from offenders is that they are avoiding Aurora Town Center and participating businesses due to this problem oriented policing approach to pattern crime. Other law enforcement agencies are adopting this program due to the demonstrated effectiveness. The program is now being adopted citywide and has received acclaim, emulation from several other law enforcement agencies in Colorado.
Certificate of Appreciation – Citizen’s Award

The Certificate of Appreciation, Citizen’s Award may be awarded by the Chief of Police to any citizen who renders valuable, courageous, or heroic assistance to members of the Aurora Police Department.

The department presented twelve (19) Certificates of Appreciation in 2015.

Anita Avalos and Rose Sabo
In Aurora Police Department’s District 1 there is a block that officers know well. On North Kramer Ct. we have had over 90 calls for service in the last year on their block. There are two neighbors that have lived here for many years and watched what was going on in their neighborhood, but instead of sitting back they became proactive and started working with Officer Tim King to try and stop the criminal activity on their street. Anita Avalos and Rose Sabo are constantly sending pictures, license plates and any other information that relates to these addresses to Officer King usually on a daily basis. Officer King has been able to identify either by past experiences or associates of drug dealers many of the people from these addresses. Previously APD has had marked units in the area watching the houses. Due to the proactive involvement of these neighbors, marked units no longer run up and down the street. This has allowed the suspects to walk around more freely, store stolen cars and harbor other wanted suspects. With the information provided from both Anita and Rose, Officer King has been able to arrest many suspects with warrants, recover stolen guns, remove drugs from the street and recover stolen vehicles that the suspects try to hide in the garages at these locations. Anita lets Officer King know when the suspects leave so arrests can be made away from the residences. One recent arrest recovered a stolen vehicle and the suspect having 3 no bond warrants, and another located and resulted in the arrest of a DOC escape suspect that was hiding out at those residences. For all of their assistance in helping the Aurora Police Department fight problem houses that have resulted in over 30 arrests this year and being proactive in the community. Anita Avalos and Rose Sabo were awarded the Aurora Police Department - Certificate of Appreciation-Citizens Award.

Larana Skalicky
On August 6, 2015 while conducting a dance class at the Kim Robard Dance Studio, Larana Skalicky came into contact with an intoxicated male that entered the studio. She asked him to leave, which he did, but he then returned a short time later with a knife in his hand, which he was holding to his throat. The male appeared to be despondent and made statements about killing himself. There were several children and adults inside the studio at the time. Larana remained calm and told her students and the adults to go into the back of the dance studio and lock themselves into the bathroom out of concern for their wellbeing. Larana then used her phone to call 911 to inform them of what was occurring. Until officers arrived, Larana continued to talk with the male in an attempt to keep him calm and to have him let go of the knife. In spite of the potential risk to her during this volatile situation Larana remained calm in her attempt to help the man and keep him from hurting himself.

Larana Skalicky was awarded the Aurora Police Department’s Certificate of Appreciation-Citizens Award.
Mr. Will Revelle, Mr. Timothy Franzen
On July 18, 2015, Sergeant Bill Revelle, Officer Chad Berger, Officer Travis Moody, Officer Jason Pray and Officer John Sangi, along with Sergeant Revelle’s son Will and friend Timothy Franzen were enjoying an off-duty camping trip at the American Basin campground. A 14 year old girl ran into the campground to get help after her father’s leg was severely broken when a boulder rolled onto it. The off-duty officers assisted other volunteers in crossing treacherous terrain, guiding search and rescue responders, and evacuating the injured man. Rescuers had a 700 foot ascent to reach the victim. Officers Moody, Berger and Pray were each given 100 pounds of gear to carry. A national guard helicopter was unable to rescue the hiker due to the treacherous terrain, so the injured man had to be carried on a stretcher back to the campground, being lowered one person at a time.

Mr. Will Revelle and Mr. Timothy Franzen were awarded with the Aurora Police Department’s Certificate of Appreciation – Citizen’s Award.

Georgia Duran, Nita Mosby Henry, Ph.D., Nate Mabe, and Nikki Mitchell
In March of 2015, the Aurora Police Department through the Chief of Police, Nicholas Metz, identified a number of initiatives to enhance its relationship with the community. One such initiative was the designation of a Recruiting Strategies Committee (RSC) comprised of internal members and private sector business partners working together to develop departmental recruiting strategies and approaches. The RSC was tasked with making recommendations to the Chief of Police, seeking not only to enhance the overall quality and quantity of applicants, but also to improve the diversification among applicants to build an organization that more closely mirrors Aurora’s multi-cultural community. The RSC was also tasked with identifying prospective community partners committed to forging strong public-private partnerships that could implement the recommendations. After nine months of collaboration, the RSC crafted a comprehensive report that will serve as the department’s recruiting blueprint for the foreseeable future and beyond. Georgia Duran, Nita Mosby Henry, Ph.D., Nate Mabe, and Nikki Mitchell were awarded the Certificate of Appreciation – Citizen’s Award.

Bruno Mary
On May 17th, 2014, Officer Dennis Dempsey responded to a vehicle verses a motorcycle crash at E. Yale Ave. just west of S. Parker Road. Upon arrival he determined that the motorcycle rider, Yevgeniy Solodukhin, had suffered a serious leg injury and was transported to the Medical Center of Aurora South for treatment, and was in surgery. Upon completion of the on scene investigation, Officer Dempsey responded to the hospital and was advised the victim was going to survive his injuries. Medical personnel advised that the victim, Solodukhin, could have bled out on the scene if a tourniquet had not been applied to his injuries. Officer Dempsey continued with his investigation, contacting a witness, Belinda Torres, who advised she and her husband were driving next to the motorcycle when the crash occurred. Belinda stated after the motorcycle impacted the car she pulled over and her husband, Bruno, exited to check on the injuries of the rider. Bruno, after evaluating the injuries, took a belt from an elderly gentleman on scene and applied it to the rider’s leg as a tourniquet to stop the bleeding. If not for the courageous and selfless actions of Bruno to help a fellow citizen’s suffering, Yevgeniy Solodukhin may have bled out and died from his injuries sustained in this horrific crash.
Adam O’Leary (Flight for Life), Zach Quinby (Flight for Life) and Jeffery Byers
On October 4, 2014, at approximately 4:26 am, Officer Richard Romero aided to District 1 officers that a vehicle was traveling the wrong way on Interstate 225. Officer Benjamin Petering observed the red GMC Sierra driving south on the west shoulder of northbound I225 approaching Alameda Avenue. The suspect stopped on I225 just north of Alameda Avenue. Officer Petering exited his patrol car and began to approach the GMC Sierra. As he neared, the suspect began to drive away, still traveling south in the north bound lanes of a well-traveled interstate. Sergeant Tim Holt was traveling south in the south bound lanes of I225. Sgt. Holt kept a constant watch on the vehicle as he paralleled the truck going south on I225. Just south of Mississippi Avenue, Sgt. Holt observed sparks from where a collision had occurred and saw the GMC Sierra laying on its side. Sgt. Holt could see that the male suspect had been ejected and was trapped underneath the truck. Sgt. Holt observed the suspect was still breathing, although it was slow, deliberate and extremely labored. Adam O’Leary and Zack Quitmby, two Childrens’ Hospital Flight for Life Medics happened to be driving on the interstate at this time and also stopped to assist. Citizen Jeff Byers who’s vehicle was hit also assisted. Realizing that the suspect’s life was clearly in danger, Sgt. Holt, officers on scene, and the three citizens surrounded the GMC Sierra and physically lifted the truck to free the suspect from the crushing weight. The suspect’s left arm was partially amputated near the bicep area. Officer Mark Moore applied a tourniquet to the suspect’s left arm near the bicep area in an attempt to stop the massive blood loss. The suspect’s left arm was eventually amputated at the hospital during surgical procedures, but he did survive the crash and is currently recovering from his injuries. The life saving actions of these Aurora Police Department officers, along with the assistance of three citizens, shows a tremendous example of commitment to community, selfless service and teamwork, providing this man with another opportunity at life.

Colton Scott
On December 12th, 2014, at 10:15 am, Colton Walker Scott was working at the Firestone Auto Care Center at 3120 S Peoria Street when he heard a large crash at the adjacent intersection of East Dartmouth Ave and South Peoria Street. The crash was caused by a female suspect that was driving a stolen vehicle. The suspect was eluding police and had gone through two red signal lights before striking a pedestrian and then crashing into a vehicle. After crashing into the vehicle the suspect exited her stolen vehicle and immediately fled the scene on foot. Colton observing the female running away from the crash took it upon himself to run after her. He chased the female suspect on foot east and then south across S. Parker Road until finally catching up to her in the RTD Park and Ride complex. Colton detained her until APD officers arrived and took her into custody. Colton could have done nothing, but instead he took it upon himself to make sure that the reckless and dangerous actions of this female suspect would not go unpunished.

Aaron Gonzalez and Misty Rose
On February 24, 2015 at 12:45 pm, a strong arm robbery that took place at S. Peoria St. and E. Mississippi Ave. As officers arrived on scene a witness, Matthew Gonzalez, pointed out the male suspect running towards 962 S. Peoria St. Matthew told officers he was in his work truck eating lunch when he observed the male suspect running around the side of a building and in front of his truck. He than saw a female pushing a baby stroller running after the male. Matthew asked the female what was wrong, she told him the male just robbed her. Matthew told her to stay there and call the police as he jumped back into his truck and went after the male. Matthew followed the suspect to 962 S. Peoria St, where he saw
officers driving by and pointed him out. Matthew was able to positively identify the suspect to police who took him into custody and transported him to jail. Without regard to his own safety Matthew took it upon himself to help the victim of this crime, follow the suspect, flag down responding officers, and bring this dangerous criminal into custody.

**Vickie Smejkal**  
On 10/12/2014, APD Officer Brian Phipps was dispatched to S. Laredo St. and E. Dartmouth Ave. on a welfare check of an elderly female. Upon arrived Ofc. Phipps contacted the reporting party Vickie Smejkal. Vickie stated that she had seen an elderly female, Jean Peck, slowly walking along the sidewalk with a cane, speaking to herself and appeared to be very cold. It was very windy and the temperature was about 45 degrees. Vickie stated that she passed Jean while traveling in her car and was concerned for her well-being, so she turned her vehicle around and stopped to check on Jean. When she contacted Jean, she seemed to be very confused and was not able to answer who she was, where she had come from, or where she was going. Vickie carefully assisted Jean into her car, turned the heat on, and called APD. Jean was very confused about the situation. AFD was called to the scene and determined Jean needed to be transported for further medical evaluation due to her physical and mental condition. Vickie's concern and compassion were truly evident as she made contact with a total stranger, provided her warmth and shelter from the near frigid temperatures and windy conditions, and notified first responders to the situation. Without her compassion for another fellow citizen in need, the events of the evening would have played out in a dramatically different manner. Vickie's actions are truly traits that others should emulate.

**Matthew Gonzalez**  
On the afternoon of August 16, 2015 a hit and run two vehicle crash occurred at the intersection of East Exposition Ave. and South Moline St. The male driver of the at fault vehicle exited his vehicle and started talking to witness Misty Rose. He was mumbling, disoriented and smelled of alcohol. During the conversation the suspect started to walk away from Misty then suddenly turned and ran off. Aaron Gonzalez, a witness on scene, also observed the male suspect run from the scene. Aaron took it upon himself and ran after the male, caught up to him, tackling him to the ground. Misty also ran after to assist. Aaron laid across the resisting suspect’s back, securing him in a head lock, while Misty held down his legs. When officers finally arrived on scene, the suspect was successfully taken into custody and taken to jail. If not for the quick and selfless actions of citizen’s Misty Rose and Aaron Gonzalez this dangerous intoxicated suspect would have fled the scene, possibly avoiding being held accountable for his actions.

**Dianne Abel**  
On February 10, 2015 Dianne Abel was driving on Havana St. near E. 13th Avenue when she saw a dog running in the street. Dianne tried to catch the dog which eventually jumped into her car. The dog had tags on it that listed the owner’s phone number and a female’s name. She attempted calling the owner but the call went to voice mail. An address was listed on the other side of the tag so she drove to the address hoping to contact the owner. Once at the address she honked her horn and a female came outside crying and said “He’s beating me up. Can you help me?” The female told her that her boyfriend had thrown the dog out into traffic and had been beating her up ever since. The male suspect came into the front yard and was yelling at her. The female told her that her purse was locked in the trunk of his
car but he wouldn’t give it to her. Even though the situation was very tense and volatile Dianne insisted that the male give the female her purse and phone. Dianne exited her vehicle and escorted the female through the house to get to where his car was parked. After retrieving these items Dianne told the female to get into her car and she would drive her to the hospital for treatment for her injuries. After further investigation, and the assistance of Dianne’s involvement, the male half of this incident was later arrested by APD officers and charged with Felony Menacing, 3rd degree Assault, False Imprisonment, and Domestic Violence. Dianne’s actions are commended as she placed her own safety aside and took it upon herself to help a total stranger in need.

**Informal Commander's Commendations**

**Commander’s Commendation Certificate**

The Commander’s Commendation Certificate may be awarded by Section and Bureau Command Officers to those members who, through their own efforts, perform their jobs in such a manner as to reflect high quality and professionalism in performance of their duties.

The department issued one-hundred eighty five (185) **Commander’s Commendations** in 2015.

**Officer Joseph Duran, Officer Tess Lamphere, Officer Patrick Benda, Sergeant Jeff Longnecker**

On January 24, 2015, District Two Officers responded to a structure fire at 18301 East Kepner Place. Upon arrival the entire stairwell was engulfed in flames from the ground to the roof. Officer Joe Duran, Officer Tess Lamphere, Officer Patrick Benda, and Sergeant Jeff Longnecker responded to assist the Aurora Fire Department. A resident in Unit 203 was trapped on his balcony but was very belligerent and refused officer orders to try to climb down. Officers were advised that an elderly female was also trapped in Unit 103. Sergeant Longnecker had to break the sliding glass door, enter the apartment, and carry the female out due to her age and confusion as to what was occurring. Officers Lamphere and Duran assisted in evacuating other residents from the multi-family complex. Officer Benda contacted Darren Campbell DOB 11/01/72, the resident of 204, advised that he had been in an argument with his ex-girlfriend at her address in District Three. He left that altercation with his current girlfriend and headed home to his apartment. His ex-girlfriend, identified as suspect Danielle Palmer DOB 12/29/73, got in her car and beat Campbell back to the Kepner address. Upon Campbell arriving he observed Palmer coming down the stairs to his apartment, where she had lit his clothing on fire using lighter fluid by the front door. AFD Arson investigators, with the assistance of District Three Officers, located Palmer at her house. She had left a phone message with Campbell implicating her involvement in setting the fire. She was arrested and held on Attempt Murder and Arson charges. The building suffered extensive damage. Several AFD personnel commented on the outstanding work done by officers and that their actions on-scene protected the lives of the occupants inside the complex. As a result of their actions these officers are hereby awarded a Commander’s Commendation for their efforts.

**Officer Michael Allen and Officer Joseph Sullivan**

On January 13th, 2015, at 2107 hours Officer Allen observed a vehicle with dark tint make an unsafe turn from 14250 E Iliff Avenue and across three eastbound lanes of traffic. The vehicle was later stopped at
East Baltic Place and Sable Blvd., based upon this probable cause. A subsequent check of the registered owner, who was also the sole occupant of the vehicle, was run through NCIC/CCIC and found to be on probation for possession of a control substance. Officer Allen contacted the driver and advised him of why he had stopped him. The driver was very elusive and declined a search of his vehicle, despite Officer Allen explaining why he would like to do so. Officer Allen had also discovered that the drivers’ driving privileges were under restrained and that he would inventory, then tow the vehicle as a result. Officer Allen used K-9 as a resource to continue his investigation which led him to believe there may be narcotics in the vehicle. An initial “sniff” by K-9 Marco did not result in any hits on the vehicle exterior but after Officer Allen had started his inventory of the vehicle, he found a baggie with a white residue. This prompted an interior “sniff” by K-9 Marco, at which time there were strong indicators around the gear shift and center console. After maneuvering the plastic cover of that area, two large baggies were located. One baggie contained 147.7 grams of suspected Methamphetamine. The other baggie contained 127.6 grams of suspected Heroin. Both substances came back as presumptive positive after micro chemical testing was completed. Both officers and K-9 Marco did a phenomenal job. Both Officer Allen and Officer Sullivan were issued a Chief’s Commendation for their efforts.

**Officer Thomas Lord, Officer Shane Ellison, Officer Eric White, Officer David Sutherland, Officer James Salazar, Officer Jason Moore, Officer Barbara Asmussen, Officer Darren Lantz, Officer Travis Lore, Detective Mike Cahenzli, Detective RJ Wilson, Administrative Specialist Tina Crux**

During the weekend of February 22, 2014, several businesses were burglarized in the south Aurora area. One location was the Metro Gang Task Force. Several electronic data storage devices with very sensitive information on them were taken. There was heightened degree of attention to find these items fur to the lost data. Video surveillance of the suspect was obtained. Officer Eric White recognized the suspect from an earlier burglary investigation and disseminated the information. Officer Shane Ellison located the stolen vehicle from another burglary and spotted the suspect who was then arrested. During this arrest, DART officers found the other suspect in possession of stolen items from MGTF. Critical high priority evidence was still missing. District 3 PAR and DART continued to work the area and were instrumental in identifying additional suspects. Officer Barbara Asmussen processed the crime scene. District 3 detectives furthered the investigation and filed the case. Approximately three weeks later, one of the stolen items was sold to a second hand store which was tracked by Tina Crux of the Pawn Unit. Detective Cahenzli recovered the stolen items and the remaining storage device taken from MGTF. Due to the determination, professionalism, and teamwork of the officers along with Detectives Cahenzli and Wilson and Administrative Specialist Tina Crux, the suspects were identified and arrested and highly sensitive evidence was recovered without any exposure or release of damaging information.

**Detective Steven Crowe, Detective Larry Martinez, Detective Sue Wynn, Detective Del Matticks, Detective Thomas McGinty, Crime Analyst Shawn Cooley**

On Sunday January 11, 2015, Sex Crimes Detective Steve Crower responded to a report of a 15 year old who reported a sexual assault. The victim stated after placing a Craigslist ad looking for work, she received a reply from a male subject using the name “Richard”, offering to pay the victim thirty (30) dollars to give her a massage. The male subject stated he needed hours of massage practice for a Swedish massage school he was attending. The 15 year old victim and her 21 year old sister communicated with the suspect for two days and sent photos back and forth before agreeing to meet
the suspect at their residence. During the massage, the suspect digitally penetrated the 15 year old victim several times and attempted to have intercourse with her. Detective Crowe solicited the help of Detectives Martinez and Wynn to assist with the investigation and Detectives Matticks and McGinty because of their computer skills. Crime Analyst Shawn Cooley sent the photo obtained by the victim to the Department of Revenue facial recognition unit. Based on the positive identification which was obtained within two hours, the detectives learned the suspect, Robert Richard Beattie Smith, had an active warrant out of California for a similar event. Detectives Matticks and McGinty surreptitiously made contact with Smith through a covert email account and arranged for Smith to meet, with what he thought was a young female. The District 1 DART team took custody of Smith as he arrived. During the subsequent interview Smith admitted to the sexual assault on our 15 year old victim and the sexual assault in California. A press release was sent to the media encouraging additional victims to file reports, which resulted in five victims calling APD, one victim calling Arapahoe County Sheriff’s Department and one filing a report in California. This is a great example of how team work and collaboration led to the quick arrest of a sexual predator and made the streets of Aurora a little safer for the citizens.

**Officer Richard Ray, Officer Ernest Gonzales, Officer Michael Moore, Officer Ricardo Hargrove, Officer Clark Orchard, Officer Paul Seiwald**

On February 9th, 2015, officers responded to the call of a robbery with a gun at the EZ Money Payday Loans located at 9520 East Colfax Avenue. Information provided indicated the suspect made the victim kneel down at gunpoint while completing the robbery. While enroute, dispatch provided a description of the suspect that had left the area on foot. Officer Moore arrived in the area, locating the suspect on foot and gave chase. Officer Gonzales responded to the updated location and observed the suspect continue to run through yards. Officer Gonzales was able to locate the suspect in a nearby yard where Officer Orchard and Officer Moore assisted in taking the party into custody. Officer Ray, Officer Seiwald, and Officer Hargrove assisted in having the suspect identified and obtaining a confession. All officers involved conducted a canvass of the area ultimately locating the cash from the robbery, disguise used by the suspect, and the weapon used. The suspect involved had a lengthy criminal history including a nationwide warrant for probation violation out of Illinois. All of the officers involved are commended for their courage, professionalism, and teamwork while capturing this violent offender.

**Officer James Benedict**

On January 12, 2015, Officer James Benedict responded on a report of an armed 15 year old female with mental health issues threatening to stab her father. Officer Benedict was the first officer on scene and found the female’s father standing by the bathroom door while the female was inside the bathroom armed with a sharp kitchen knife. She was very agitated, crying, and breathing heavily. Officer Benedict directed the father to leave the residence for his safety. Using a calm and reassuring voice, Officer Benedict was able to soothe the female to the point where she became compliant with officers. The female put the knife on the floor and Officer Benedict continued speaking with her and keeping her calm while she was searched, evaluated by AFD, and ultimately transported to the hospital. Officer Benedict was awarded this commander’s commendation for his exceptional patience and effective communication skills which brought this very dangerous situation to a successful and safe conclusion.
Officer Jonathan Carelock, Officer Kristopher McDowell, Officer Richard Mervin, Officer Ryan Sweeney
On 4-12-15 Officer Carelock and McDowell responded to 893 N Dawson St on the report of a man armed with a knife. Further dispatch information advised that the man, Jose Del Alamo, bit his sister on the arm and then armed himself with a kitchen knife. Upon arrival Officer McDowell learned that the subject had retreated into the basement, and was still armed with a knife. He immediately began speaking with Del Alamo, and created a rapport, speaking from upstairs, while the subject remained in the basement. Officer Carelock requested more cars and a supervisor. Officers Mervin, Sweeney and Sergeant White responded. Officer McDowell was speaking to the man, who was clearly in a mental crisis state. The male was threatening that if officers came down into the basement, they would be carrying him out in a body bag. The Officers decided who was going to be less lethal, lethal and hands on, while Officer McDowell continued to calm the subject down. After speaking to the subject for about 45 minutes Officer McDowell had talked their way into the basement, and was speaking face to face with the subject. After several more minutes, the subject finally dropped the knife behind the couch and allowed fire to come and evaluate him. In the end the subject walked on his own to the rescue crew where he was later transported to the hospital for a psychological evaluation. This situation called for consistent tactical evaluation, CIT level negotiations, and team coordination to come to a peaceful and successful conclusion. All officers received a commendation for their diligent and persistent actions to successfully end this standoff.

Sergeant Steven White
Officers Terry Patton, John Yates and Doug Stark responded to a suicidal and homicidal female named Sitara Mian. Her mother had called in saying that her daughter had threatened to kill her and her son and then kill herself. Officer Patton advised that upon his arrival on scene, he saw Sitara at the front door. He said she then ran inside and barricaded herself in an upstairs bedroom where she had access to weapons. Sergeant Steve White arrived on scene and is a trained consistent tactical evaluation (CIT) officer. Sergeant White began a dialogue with Sitara and did an outstanding job of calming her down and having her come out of the room without incident. Sergeant White showed exemplar skills and was a key component of this situation ending peacefully. Sergeant White was commended for his skills, dedication and professionalism in this case.

Sergeant Phil Rathbun
On March 19, 2015 a victim was robbed at knifepoint of their vehicle in Glendale Colorado. Glendale Police entered the vehicle as stolen into CCIC/NICIC with the notation of “Suspects armed and dangerous, use caution, armed with a knife”. Later that morning Aurora Police dispatch received an alert based on the vehicles travel along the Colfax corridor. The alert provided the stolen vehicle entry to include the “armed and dangerous” remark along with a photo of the actual vehicle which matched the entry. Sergeant Phil Rathbun was in the area when the information about the stolen vehicle was aired. A short time later he found the vehicle near Colfax Avenue and Havana Street. The vehicle circled the block and proceeded East on Colfax Avenue. Officers attempted to stop the vehicle as it turned south on Moline Street from Colfax Avenue. The vehicle eluded officers continuing South on Moline Street. Officers engaged in a vehicle pursuit with Sergeant Rathbun assuming the role of the primary car. The pursuit continued through portions of North Aurora ultimately ending up on Highway E-470
and East 56th Avenue. Sergeant Rathbun sought and received permission to perform a PIT maneuver. He executed the maneuver with precision at a reasonable speed as dictated in training and directives wherein the suspect vehicle slid off the roadway and into a muddy field. The two suspects were still armed and taken into custody without further incident. There was negligible damage to the police and suspect vehicles. It was later discovered that both suspects were wanted on active warrants based on prior robberies. Throughout the pursuit, Sergeant Rathbun provided clear and concise updates on the radio as to the speeds and descriptions of the suspects, details known at the time from the Glendale robbery case, traffic and road conditions. It was due to this effective communication that the Watch Commander was able to make minute-by-minute assessments of the need to continue the pursuit balanced with citizen safety concerns. Sergeant Rathbun maintained the presence of mind to consider all attendant circumstances of a supervisory officer while directly involved in the pursuit. He is to be commended on his ability to assess and communicate the ongoing justification for a pursuit of two armed and dangerous offenders, bringing the incident to a safe and effective conclusion.

**Officers Mark Hartman, Officer Renda Albergotti, Officer Fred Lang, Officer Amber Buck, Officer Michael Quirk, Officer Blake Beasley**

On April 25, 2015, at 0404 hours, District 3 officers were dispatched to 14240 East Radcliff Circle on a report of a car that crashed into a house. Upon arrival, officers found the vehicle crashed through the walls of three town homes. The majority of the load bearing walls were also destroyed and the structure was at risk of collapsing. Officer Hartman and Officer Beasley entered the structure to tend to the driver of the vehicle who was highly intoxicated and trapped inside the vehicle under a large amount of debris. Officers Hartman, Albergotti, Lang, Buck, Quirk, and Beasley could hear screaming coming from the affected units. They entered the units and evacuated all of the residents to a safe place. AFD arrived on scene and was able to stabilize the structure with load bearing supports. It wasn’t until this time that the driver of the car could be safely removed. Later when the building inspector arrived on scene, he stated that the damage to the structure was so severe, he was amazed the middle of the three units hadn’t entirely collapsed and wasn’t sure how it was still standing. Officers Mark Hartman, Renda Albergotti, Fred Lang, Amber Buck, Michael Quirk, and Blake Beasley put their own safety and lives in danger by entering the unstable buildings in order to evacuate the residents and were awarded a Commander’s Commendation for their selfless bravery.

**Officer Fred Lang**

On April 24, 2015, at 2300 hours, District 3 Officer Fred Lang was patrolling in the area of the 7-11 store located at 18883 East Hampden Avenue. He observed a blue PT Cruiser backed into a parking spot with no front plate and then observed three males at the side of the building in a poorly lit area. Officer Lang was aware of recent 7-11 robberies in the area and circled the area again to find the males gone. He ran the rear plate and found the vehicle was stolen. He called for more units and walked to the corner of the building where he contacted and detained one of the males who was talking toward the vehicle. He ran the rear plate and found the vehicle was stolen. He called for more units and walked to the corner of the building where he contacted and detained one of the males who was talking toward the vehicle. He determined that the male was on a pretrial ankle monitor for aggravated robbery. The other two males were gone. Store video showed this same male going into the store and making a small purchase while suspiciously looked around the store, then returning to the front door where he gave some hand gestures to the other males outside. He opened the door, said something to them and reentered the store. A few seconds later video shows one of the two males quickly walk to the front door, see the
customers inside, and take off running back towards the location of the stolen vehicle. Both males returned, entered the store and spoke to the male inside. All three looked around suspiciously then exited the store as Officer Lang pulled back into the area and detained the one male. Based on the actions of the males at the store, there is no doubt they were intending on robbing the store. Officer Lang’s keen observations and knowledge of recent crime patterns resulted in the recovery of a stolen vehicle and an aggravated robbery having been averted. Officer Lang was issued a Commander’s Commendation for the professionalism he exemplified through proactive policing.

**Officer James Waselkow**

On February 11, 2015, Officer Waselkow was conducting surveillance on the Travel lodge, an area known for drug use and prostitution. Officer Waselkow observed a vehicle leave the motel. He conducted a traffic stop and made contact with the people inside the vehicle. One of the occupants was a 17 year old female who was found to be a runaway. Officer Waselkow found further evidence of possible prostitution, which she admitted to, but claimed she no longer had a pimp. Based on the circumstances of the contact and the 17 year old female’s statement, Officer Waselkow forwarded the information to the FBI Innocence Lost Task Force. Task force investigators later contacted the female. From the contact and subsequent investigation, a multi-state operation exposed activity involving numerous juvenile prostitutes and adult pimps. During his investigation, Officer Waselkow isolated and identified one of the pimps whose criminal history included charges of homicide, aggravated assault and sex assault on a child. The investigation resulted in several arrests and new information was discovered on related activities. Due to Officer Waselkow’s diligence and assessment of the contact, a juvenile prostitution ring was discovered. Officer Waselkow was issued a Commander’s Commendation for his continuous dedication in his profession and to the community.

**Officer Cory Budaj**

On February 26, 2015, Officer Budaj was dispatched to the “D Cellulars” Store on East Colfax Avenue. Officer Budaj was informed that an adult male customer had just inappropriately touched the 11 year old daughter of the store owner. Aurora Police dispatchers gave Officer Budaj a description of the suspect and vehicle. The suspect was in the process of leaving the store. Upon arrival, Officer Budaj found the described vehicle by the store unoccupied and still running. Officer Budaj entered the store and learned that the adult male had just left and confirmed the male’s description. Officer Budaj then quickly set out to find the suspect. He observed footprints in the snow in the direction of where the suspect was last seen. While following the footprints, Officer Budaj observed a male matching the description provided to him. Officer Budaj called to the male who began running away. A foot pursuit ensued and for a brief moment Officer Budaj lost sight of the male but was able to get the suspect’s direction from other people in the area. Officer Budaj continued to search for the male and again found footprints leading to a space under a mobile home. The male suspect was found hiding there and he was placed into custody without incident. Officer Budaj immediately began to investigate the circumstances of the incident, including having the victim positively identify the suspect. It was discovered that the male had multiple warrants. Through Officer Budaj’s quick response and decision making a suspect was quickly apprehended who may have otherwise not been found. Officer Budaj displayed high level of commitment in his role as a first responder and was awarded a Commander’s Commendation for his professionalism and dedication.
Officer Jim Gentry and Agent Jason McDonald

Officer J. Gentry responded to Serta Mattress Manufacturing on a complaint of possible fraud or theft. Serta was alerted to several mattress sets being sold either on the internet or out of rental trucks. On one such occasion in Hays, Kansas, people were selling the mattress sets at a reduced price advertising them as over stock, not “As Is” (used) across the street from a Serta dealer. Officer Gentry could have viewed this situation as a Civil Matter but decided to author an Embezzlement Report. Officer Gentry after authoring the initial report, responded to the detective sergeant to advise a report was on the way. He had a feeling based upon the facts and initial investigation this incident was much bigger than it appeared. Detective McDonald’s investigation revealed Serta accepts mattress set returns as part of their Warranty Program and then donates the “As Is” mattress sets to Ecumenical Refugee and Immigration Services Inc., (a charity). The charity donation coordinator, Genevieve Cruz, assured Serta all the mattress sets donated, were going to the charity and stored at their storage facilities. Ms. Cruz was present and signed for the mattress sets. The storage unit had been in her name but was transferred to Adam Shryrock, her volunteer. Mr. Shryock has been convicted of Theft and Charity Fraud reference his BOOBIES ROCK scam. It was determined, since March of 2014 to January of 2015, Serta had donated 1,608 mattress sets to Ecumenical, 500 mattress sets have been distributed to refugee housing, and 164 mattress sets remain in storage with Ecumenical. It is believed Ms. Cruz and Mr. Shryock sold 944 mattress sets that were supposed to go to the charity. The 944 mattress sets were sold, plus the 119 mattress sets recovered from the storage facility on E. 40th Ave (not an Ecumenical storage facility) were in the process of being sold equals 1,063 mattress sets stolen from the charity. Using the estimated value by Serta on the “As Is” donated mattress sets, the charity sustained a loss of $1,063,000.00. On 02/23/15, Adams County DA filed Charitable Fraud Theft ($1,000,000.00 and over), on Genevieve Cruz. On 04/24/15, Adams County DA filed Charitable Fraud Theft ($1,000,000.00 and over), on Adam Shryock.

Officer Eugene VanDyk and Officer Jeremy Stenersen

On June 4, 2015, Officers Eugene Vandyk and Jeremy Stenersen were dispatched to 15530 E. 12th Avenue for an unknown problem. Dispatch aired that a knife was involved in the altercation. Upon arrival, Officer Vandyk was approached by the victim who had a very large laceration to the side of his neck. At the same time, the suspect began walking toward the officers. Officers Vandyk and Stenersen ordered the suspect to the ground at gunpoint and he complied. Officer Vandyk then produced his own medical gear and began to apply pressure to the neck wound with gauze. Officer Stenersen held the suspect at gunpoint until other officers arrived and he could be taken into custody. Officer Vandyk kept the victim calm and kept pressure on the wound until the fire department arrived. Once the victim was taken to the hospital Officer Vandyk assisted with searching the crime scene. He was able to locate the knife in a bush where it was very hard to see. Due to the action of these officers, the victim was properly taken care of and the suspect was charged with attempted murder. This was excellent police work.

Officer Brad Graham

On March 24, 2015, SWAT assisted FAST in apprehending Jerold Hernandez, wanted for failing to appear for sentencing for his 1st Degree Murder, POWPO, and Felony Menacing conviction; he was also a suspect in a Denver double homicide. Hernandez was observed standing by a vehicle in an alley, with an unknown male standing nearby and an unknown male in the driver’s seat of the vehicle. When the SWAT officers
deployed, Hernandez reached to his rear waistband and began pulling upward as if he was removing something from his pants. Officer Graham feared that Hernandez was retrieving a weapon and discharged one 40 mm foam round at Hernandez. Hernandez fell to the ground and was taken safely into custody by Officers Gonzales and Edwards without any further use of force. A Tec-9 machine pistol and Kel-Tec 9mm handgun were recovered from the vehicle. It was later determined that Hernandez had remove the Tec-9 from his rear waistband and dropped the gun in the window when shot by the 40 mm foam round. A FN 5.7 handgun was located just south of the van’s location; it is believed it was dropped by the male who had run from the scene and was apprehended a short distance away. All members of the arrest team worked together and were able to render safe a very chaotic and dangerous scene. Officer Edwards moved quickly and aggressively, taking away opportunity for the suspects to act. Officer Graham’s quick and decisive action to deploy less lethal probably kept the arresting officers from being involved in exchange of gun fire with Hernandez. Officer Gonzales remained calm during a stressful encounter, used appropriate arrest control to place Hernandez in custody, and removed him from the area so that the driver could be contacted safely. While other officers were occupied with Hernandez, Officer Ficco continued to his assignment and held the driver, who was also in possession of a firearm, at gunpoint until he was removed and arrested. The training, experience, and professionalism of these officers resulted in the safe arrest of three armed suspects under circumstances that could have easily resulted in a deadly force incident.

Officer Matthew Springer

On June 27, 2015, Officer Matthew Springer responded to the report of a robbery at Blue Grama Grass Park, located at 3323 South Jericho Way. Based on the victim’s identification of the suspect, Officer Springer was able to quickly identify a current address where he located and Mirandized the juvenile suspect with the parent’s permission, obtaining a confession to the robbery charge. Additionally, Officer Springer was able to recover the money that was taken as well as the weapon used in the crime, an Airsoft matching the appearance of the reported black semi-automatic hand gun. Officer Springer is awarded this Commander’s Commendation for his professionalism and diligence in solving a 1st degree robbery. His attention to excellent police work is appreciated and recognized.

Lieutenant Lee Silver

On May 1, 2015, at approximately 1549 hours, a Gateway High School student, walking the open field near the Center Pointe Bus terminal was struck by lightning. The condition of the student was not good. Lt. Lee Silver recognized the seriousness of the situation and made arrangements for Victim Services to contact and assist the family that night. He also saw to it that Aurora Public Schools was made aware of the tragedy. Lt. Silver has continued to monitor the condition of the student. Lt. Silver found out the student’s condition is grave and he is not expected to survive. Lt. Silver learned that the student’s father, who is from Mexico, is visiting on a visa which was about to expire. He also learned that the victim’s sister, who was with the victim the night he was struck, was having issues as a result of the accident. Lt. Silver reached back to Victim Services to assist the family. Lt. Silver also contacted a local church about rendering assistance. Carol O’Shea, of our Victim Services Unit advised it was the direct involvement from Lt. Silver which alerted them to the needs of the family. Because of Lt. Silver, Victim Services has been able to assist with the visa extension along with other help for the family during this tragedy. Ms. O’Shea felt Lt. Silver had a direct impact on the level of customer service given to the
family by the police department. Lieutenant Lee Silver is hereby commended for his compassion for the family as well as his dedication and professionalism in this matter.

**Officer VanDyk and Officer Michael Tilton**

Officers Gene Vandyk and Michael Tilton responded to a welfare check. The 20 year old female told dispatch that she was trying to kill herself by taking pills and would walk outside to meet the officers. Upon arrival, the officers approached the front porch and observed a female near the door. As the female turned toward the officers, they both observed a black pistol in her hand down by her side. The officers immediately took cover and gave the female orders to drop the pistol. The female complied with orders and dropped the gun. She was then safely taken into custody on an M-1 hold. Upon closer inspection of the pistol, it was discovered by the officers to be a BB gun. It looked identical to a real Walther P99 pistol. The female admitted to officers that she picked up the gun as she exited the house because she was going to point the gun at them so they would shoot her in a “suicide by cop”. The BB gun was placed into property for destruction at the request of the owner, the female’s mother. Officers Vandyk and Tilton did a very good job of using a safe approach to the residence, finding a position of cover, and giving the female verbal commands to drop the pistol. Further, they displayed amazing restraint in not engaging the female with lethal force. This was a job very well done and the officers are commended.

**Sergeant Casidee Carlson, Officer Mike Dziurgot, Officer Bobbie Jo Olson, Officer Chris Barchetti, Officer David McNamee, Officer Robin Thompson, Officer Candice Iovine, Officer Dan Iovine, Officer Jennifer Krause, Officer Brandt Smith, and Officer Jay VanKam**

During the week of June 22-June 26, 2015, several members of the Aurora Police Department, District 2, volunteered their time to assist with the Operation Nehemiah Youth Basketball camp sponsored by the Restoration Christian Fellowship Church. Officers assisted with coaching, mentoring, logistics and youth development. Organizers were impressed with how much the Aurora Police Department Officers engaged with the youth and their personal investment with the community. It was noted that without the assistance of the Aurora Police Department volunteers, the camp would not have been as successful. The following officers should be commended for their selfless support to the Christian Fellowship Church and to the youth of our community.

**Officer William Woods, Sergeant Graham Dunne, Officer Faith Goodrich, Officer Bryan Knox, Officer Michael Moore, Officer Brian O’Halloran, and Officer Leslie Roberts**

Officers Bryan Knox, Leslie Roberts, and Brian O’Halloran responded to East 8th Avenue and Fulton Street reference a carjacking at knife point. Officer O’Halloran located the stolen vehicle in the 1100 block of Geneva Street. A male suspect ran from the vehicle and a female stayed with it. Officers O’Halloran and Roberts took the female driver into custody and Sergeant Graham Dunne set up a perimeter for the male suspect. Officer Faith Goodrich was able to speak with witnesses and pinpoint the suspect’s location. Officer Bill Woods was able to locate the suspect. Officers Knox and Woods then took the suspect into custody. Officer Mike Moore transported the victim to the arrest scene and a positive identification was made of the male suspect. The suspect had an extensive out of state violent criminal history.
Officer Javen Harper and Officer Scott Brandon
On March 24, 2014, at approximately 0018, a fatal motor vehicle accident occurred at E. Colfax Avenue and N. Dayton Street. Officers Javen Harper and John Yates responded to investigate the accident. The scene contained significant debris in the roadway from the Ford Expedition driven by Ever Olivos-Gutierrez and the Chevrolet Camaro driven by Juan Domínguez-Palomino (deceased). Olivos-Gutierrez told responding Officers he was drunk and did not remember what happened. Officers Harper and Yates completed the reconstruction of the accident scene. The pre-crash and crash was recorded by Mesh Cameras that were located along E. Colfax Avenue. Officer Harper used the video from three of the cameras to determine the speed of the Expedition. Officer Harper’s calculations produced an average speed of 67.01 MPH and a time/distance calculation resulting in a speed of 67.72 MPH. Officer Yates completed a 360° Momentum calculation for the Expedition and determined the minimum speed of the Expedition was 69.3 MPH. The speed limit on E. Colfax Avenue is 30 MPH. Officers Harper and Scott Brandon conducted the alignment of the two vehicles involved at maximum engagement, which showed the intrusion of the Expedition into the Camaro from the passenger side to just into the right side of the driver’s compartment. Agent Casey Crowfoot coordinated the investigation and filed the case. Arapahoe County prosecutors said that the thoroughness of the investigation led to the successful conclusion of this case. The work performed by Officers Brandon, Harper, Yates and Agent Crowfoot resulted in Olivos-Gutierrez pleading guilty to Murder in the 2nd degree and being sentenced to 40 years in the Department of Corrections.

Officer Stephenson Cary
On 04-24-15 at about 0407, District 1 officers responded to 1090 S. Havana St. on a report of an armed robbery. During the night there had been a string of armed robberies of convenience stores in both Aurora and Denver. During a robbery at 11th and Yosemite in Denver, shots had been fired by the suspect(s). Instead of going to the location of the robbery where there were already several cars, Officer Stephenson Cary began checking the area south on Havana St. where he thought the suspects had been likely to travel. He located a likely suspect vehicle parked in a suspicious location at 800 S. Havana St. The vehicle fit the description and was occupied by suspects also matching the description. Officer Cary followed this vehicle and upon having cover cars with him, attempted to stop it. The vehicle sped away and shortly thereafter, crashed into a fence behind 455 N. Havana St. Two suspects fled on foot and Officer Cary remained with the other suspect in the car. A handgun and incriminating evidence were seen and documented in the car which was processed by CSI. The other two suspects were apprehended after a perimeter was set up. Officer Cary is to be commended for his attention to duty and using his training and experience to recognize and ultimately capture three dangerous felons.

Sergeant Edward Acuti, Sergeant Rex McKinney, Officer Aaron Benes, Officer Chad Berger, Officer Darren Chamberland, Officer Jeremy Fink, Officer Matthew T. Green, Officer Sheldon Irons, Officer Daniel Madera, Officer Kindel Padilla, Agent David Perry, Officer Randy Roedema, Agent Thomas Sobieski, Officer James Salazar, Officer Robert Thompson, Agent Thomas Wilson, and Officer Patrick Youngquist.
On May 7, 2015, three separate pizza delivery businesses were robbed within a short period of time. The suspect was described as a white male matching the same description of two other robberies which occurred a few days earlier. A red truck was identified as the suspect vehicle and District 3 detectives aired this information. Swing shift officers who were just coming on duty joined day shift officers in searching for the suspect vehicle. Officer Chamberland located the suspect vehicle with the suspect
standing outside. Additional officers responded into the area and the suspect was safely taken into custody. This would not have been possible had it not been for the collaborative efforts of officers assigned to the District 3 Patrol, PAR and Detective Units. The following officers are hereby awarded a Commander’s Commendation for their teamwork in expeditiously apprehending a dangerous, prolific robbery suspect, without incident: Sergeant Edward Acuti, Sergeant Rex McKinney, Officer Aaron Benes, Officer Chad Berger, Officer Darren Chamberland, Officer Jeremy Fink, Officer Matthew T. Green, Officer Sheldon Irons, Officer Daniel Madera, Officer Kindel Padilla, Agent David Perry, Officer Randy Roedema, Agent Thomas Sobieski, Officer James Salazar, Officer Robert Thompson, Agent Thomas Wilson, and Officer Patrick Youngquist.

Officer Michael Iovine, Officer Christopher Schipke, and Officer Jose Ortiz
On August 11, 2015, at approximately 0033 hours, District 2 Patrol Officers Michael Iovine, Christopher Schipke, and Jose Ortiz responded to a report of a disturbance and unknown problem. During their ensuing investigation, the officers determined that there had been a domestic violence between a male and female partner. The 30-year old male (Kyle McGowan) was the primary aggressor and he had driven from the scene. The officers observed the male drive back into the area. Officers Schipke, Iovine and Ortiz immediately ordered the driver to stop the car. The suspect stopped but refused to follow multiple orders to “show his hands.” He kept his right hand down near his right front pocket. Officer Schipke then smashed out the driver’s window, unlocked the door, and pulled McGowan from the vehicle. He was immediately taken to the ground. McGowan resisted arrest, placing both hands under his clothes near the waistband of his pants. Officers were able to safely gain control of McGowan and handcuff him. McGowan was searched and a loaded .380 pistol was discovered where he had been reaching during his arrest. The Pistol was seized. Officers Iovine, Ortiz and Schipke through their personal efforts, teamwork and restraint performed their jobs in such a manner as to reflect high quality and professionalism in the performance of their duties and are hereby awarded the Aurora Police Department Commander’s Commendation.

Officer Scott Osgood, Officer Craig Collins, Officer Chad Elliott, Officer Barry Martin, Officer Bobby Wong, and Sergeant Jason Paulovich
On June 24th, 2015 at 1120 hours, Officers Craig Collins, Chad Elliott, Barry Martin, Scott Osgood, and Bobby Wong were working on East Colfax Avenue when a hit for a stolen motorcycle came over their computer via a fixed LPR at Colfax and Havana Street. The motorcycle was a steal out of California. The black, silver, and red 2006 Suzuki Hayabusa was traveling westbound on East Colfax Avenue from Havana Street. Officer Collins was at East Colfax Avenue and Dallas Street when he spotted the motorcycle still traveling westbound on East Colfax Avenue. Officer Collins began to follow the motorcycle and confirmed it had the plate listed in the stolen vehicle hit. Officers Elliott and Osgood, who were waiting at East Colfax and Dallas Street, saw the motorcycle and Officer Collins pass and they began to follow. As the motorcycle approached the red light at Quebec Street, Officer Collins was able to get in front of the motorcycle. Officers Osgood and Elliott got behind the motorcycle and activated their emergency lights then approached the motorcyclist on foot. Officer Elliott held the suspect at gun point on the left and Officer Osgood had the right with a taser. Officer Elliott ordered the driver to shut off the motorcycle, put the kick stand down, and get off the motorcycle. The suspect complied but stiffened up when Officer Elliott approached to handcuff him. Officer Elliott was able to get the suspect to his stomach and with assistance from Sergeant Paulovich was able to handcuff the suspect. Officers Martin and Wong were able to locate
a handgun and drugs on the suspect. Officers Martin and Wong were able to locate a handgun and drugs on the suspect. Officer Martin performed a micro-chemical analysis and concluded it was positive for methamphetamine.

Officer Adam Price, Officer Gergely Boros, Officer Robert Fowler, Officer Barry Gomez, Officer Ernest Gonzales, Officer Christopher Thivierge, and Officer Daniel Veith

On May 4th, 2015, District 1 Officers Robert Fowler, Gergely Boros, Daniel Veith, Adam Price, Ernest Gonzales, Christopher Thivierge, and Barry Gomez responded to assist Tom Faustin in the area of E. Colfax Avenue and Moline Street. Officer Faustin had just been intentionally struck by a suspect vehicle. Officer Faustin had been injured and he was engage in a vehicle pursuit. Officers quickly responded to the area and located the suspect vehicle after Officer Faustin had to stop pursing when his vehicle became inoperable. Officer Fowler was able to get close enough to the suspect vehicle to obtain a partial license plate. Officers were also able to get a general description of the driver. With this extremely limited amount of information the aforementioned officers immediately began conducting suspicious person contacts along the E Colfax Avenue corridor, obtaining multiple listing of similar vehicles based on the partial plate and compiling a list of addresses for registered owners that were consistent with the suspect information. Through the use of networking with other department resources the officers were able to pin point the suspect vehicle to 1764 Elmira Street. The vehicle was not initially located. However, the assisting officers continued surveillance and checking the residence. Through their efforts, the suspect vehicle was recovered at the residence and the suspect was taken into custody without incident the same night. The suspect was subsequently charged with the attempt murder of Officer Faustin.

Agent Brian McClure

Detective Brian McClure was assigned Case #14-37660, which involved an 87 year-old man being taken advantage of by a 41 year-old woman in what is known as a “Sweetheart Scam”. The woman, and her husband, swindled almost $100,000 from the victim in less than a month. During the investigative process the victim would often call Detective McClure to discuss the case, among other things, and Brian always found time to talk with him. When the case went to a preliminary hearing the victim spoke very highly of the police department, and especially about Detective McClure. It was discovered that Detective McClure actually picked the victim up and drove him to the hearing because he had no family and no other means to get there. Detective McClure exhibited not only the highest degree of professionalism in his investigation and testimony, but actually went above and beyond any expectations of his job by ensuring that the victim got to and from the court hearing safely. Detective McClure’s actions in this case reflected greatly upon himself, his team, and the Aurora Police Department.

Officer Jay Van Kam and Officer Jason McIrvin

On January 28th, 2015, while on routine patrol, Officers McIrvin and Jay Van Kam observed a teenaged male standing at an intersection with a briefcase and a backpack at his feet. Realizing that the average teenager does not usually carry a briefcase, they felt this individual warranted investigation. As the officers turned their vehicle around to get a better look at him, he picked up the items and ran, hopping a fence into a backyard. A foot chase ensued and involved several D2 PAR officers, District 2
and District 3 patrol officers and D2 BIG officers. The suspect was eventually caught and the briefcase and backpack were recovered. Paperwork in the backpack listed to an Aurora address. Officers responded to that address and found evidence of a recent burglary. Residents of that address happened to arrive while officers were on-scene and were able to identify property recovered in the backpack and the briefcase. Officers Van Kam and McIrvin often work together and they both know that Area 17 has had numerous burglaries and is a CQT target area. They both recognized that the part was suspicious and took action to address their concerns.

**Sergeant Dave Cernich, Agent Douglas Daufeldt, Agent Nick Huber, Officer Jeremiah Cooley, Officer Scott Wicklund, Officer Nicholas Muldoon, and Officer Dan Pell**

Detective Nick Huber was assigned an armed robbery case which occurred on 09/15/14 at 17901 E 40th Ave. He developed a suspect in the case who was later identified as Temmell King (11/17/79). King was believed to be responsible for numerous armed robberies in Aurora and Denver. On 09/26/14, Detective Huber and several DPD detectives had located King in the 2300 block of S. Troy Street in Aurora and immediately notified the District 2 DART team. DART Officers Wicklund, Pell, Muldoon, Cooley, and Sergeant Cernich quickly responded to the area. While enroute, a tactical plan was formed and upon arrival King was taken into custody without incident. He immediately refused an interview and was transported to the jail. King’s girlfriend, Sara Hayes, who was on scene, voluntarily consented to an interview with detectives. During the course of the vehicle inventory, the DART officers recognized items in the vehicle to be evidence of a recent robbery. The car was sealed and towed to impound. During the interview, Sara gave voluntary consent to search her residence, which was conducted by the DART members who had located numerous items of evidentiary value, to include a mask, gloves, clothes from numerous robberies and a handgun. These items linked King to several open robbery cases in the metro area. The DART officers should be commended for their ability to formulate a tactical plan while enroute, and the flawless execution, which led to the arrest of a prolific armed and violent robbery suspect. Detectives Huber and Daufeldt were commended for their detective prowess and their ability to gain the cooperation of Sara, which resulted in locating the much needed evidence to secure an arrest of this dangerous suspect. Together, they all exemplify the key values of the Aurora Police Department and provided great service to the citizens of Aurora.

**Officer Jordan Odneal and Officer Ashley Orr**

On July 25, 2015, Officer Jordan Odneal was on routine patrol when he located a vehicle with stolen license plates traveling southbound. Officer Odneal conducted a traffic stop. He subsequently identified the driver and arrested him for multiple arrest warrants. During inventory of the vehicle, Officer Odneal located a machete and a sawed-off shotgun inside the vehicle. Officer Ashley Orr arrived on scene to assist, and noted the driver and vehicle matched the description of a robbery she had taken two days earlier. On that date, District 1 had two armed robberies an hour apart, with the same description of a male armed with a shotgun. In each of these cases a suspect was not yet identified. Due to the excellent teamwork and keen observations of Officer Odneal and Officer Orr, Detectives were able to complete a successful follow-up investigation. The victim then identified the arrested driver as the prior robbery suspect. Through their own initiative and perseverance, Officer J. Odneal and Officer A. Orr displayed the utmost in professionalism which led to the arrest of a violent and armed individual. Officer Ashley Orr is hereby awarded the Aurora Police Department’s Commander’s Commendation.
Officer William Miller, Officer James Benedict, and Officer Philip Rathbun

On September 27, 2015, Dispatch aired a robbery in progress at the Walgreen’s on E. Iliff Avenue. The suspect vehicle was seen leaving the area. Officers William Miller, James Benedict and Sergeant Philip Rathbun responded to the area and strategically positioned themselves along potential escape routes from that area. Officer Miller, who had taken a position at E. Florida/S. Sable Boulevard spotted the vehicle approaching him on E. Florida Ave. As the vehicle turned east on E. Florida, Officer Miller aired that he had the vehicle in sight and turned around to follow it. Sergeant Rathbun and Officer Benedict who were also in the area, caught up with Officer Miller. They conducted a high risk stop on the vehicle. The driver was hesitant to stop, but finally did, and refused to comply with orders, and began walking towards the officers. He was taken into custody without incident, and was positively identified as the robbery suspect. Evidence of the robbery was located in his vehicle. The actions of Officers Miller and Benedict and Sergeant Rathbun demonstrated excellent police work, maturity and team coordination. They used great restraint and safe tactics to take the uncooperative suspect into custody without using force or causing injury. All three officers are commended for their dedication to duty as well as their professionalism in dealing with an armed suspect who assaulted a pharmacy employee with a deadly weapon.

Sergeant Dave Cernich, Officer Jared Krieger, Officer Roland Albert, Officer Jeremiah Cooley, Officer Scott Wicklund, Officer Nick Muldoon

At approximately 2230 hours, District 1 officers responded to a shooting. Due to a large hostile crowd gathering, a call went out requesting all available DART Officers to respond to the scene. District 3 DART Officer Dave Sutherland, Erick Ortiz, and Justin Shipley, immediately responded to assist even though they were at the end of their shift, along with District 2 DART Officer Nicholas Muldoon, while the rest of DART diverted for a time due to another reported shooting on East 6th Avenue. DART 3 Officers immediately joined K-9 Officers and began an area search looking for the suspects. During this time a involved subject was discovered hiding in a bush and detained. It was discovered the incident was captured on video. While reviewing this video, Officer Muldoon immediately realized he recognized the suspect and located the suspects name, address, and picture. DART 3 Officers went to the suspects residence to establish surveillance in case he returned home. They were later joined by DART 2 Officers and Sergeant Dave Cernich who responded to the Major Crimes Unit to liaison with MCU Detectives conducting interviews. The DART 2 & 3 officers, maintained surveillance on the location for multiple hours. At approximately 0500 hours, a female and male left the residence and got into a vehicle. The male was believed to be the homicide suspect. A traffic stop was conducted and the suspect was taken into custody.

Alfred Roberson

On May 1, 2015, Officer Roberson was off duty in the Colorado Springs area, and observed a vehicle matching the description of a wanted suspect in connection with an attempted homicide. The suspect, identified as Joshua Casey, had an arrest warrant for Attempted Murder, during which he allegedly shot another individual several times with a handgun. Officer Roberson had been previously aware of this suspect from a bulletin given out during a Aurora Police Department briefing. Once he realized this was the same vehicle, he maintained his composure and called the Colorado Springs Police Department Communications Department, advising them of his police status and the direction of travel of the suspect vehicle. He maintained his distance and followed the suspect while giving updates to dispatch. Officers
began flooding the area, but the suspect was lost. Officer Roberson and his radio actions eventually led to locating the suspect vehicle near the area where it was initially lost. The suspect was taken into custody without incident. Officer Roberson was instrumental in not only locating the suspect and keeping him in sight, but also directing officers into the area. He kept the safety of citizens a priority by not being too aggressive during the surveillance. On behalf of the Colorado Springs Department, Sergeant Carlos Sandoval extends his appreciation to Officer Roberson in reflecting his commitment to service regardless of the community he is in by assisting in the apprehension of an armed and dangerous suspect. He reflects positively on the Aurora Police Department by his commitment to community and maintaining the highest core values.

Officer Jason Taft
On January 21st, 2014, Officer Taft responded to Macy’s at Town Center for a reported shoplift which escalated into an armed robbery. Two suspects collected handfuls of clothing and then exited the store using physical force to kick open an exit door which was blocked by a loss prevention associate. Once at their vehicle, the male suspect was challenged by loss prevention. He pulled a sawed off shotgun and menaced the employee. Both suspects then fled in the vehicle. Officer Taft quickly gathered what information he could and began diligently working the case. Based on his investigation, he reached out to the Colorado Springs Police Department via teletype, sharing essential details and descriptions while asking for follow up assistance at the residence of the registered owner. As a result of Officer Taft’s quick response and communication with an outside agency, Colorado Springs Police officers were able to quickly capture the suspects, their vehicle, and the illegal weapon used in the commission of a crime. Within just a few hours of the robbery, Aurora police officers transported the suspects and the weapon back to Aurora where they were interrogated by and confessed to detectives. Detective Roberts advised that Officer Taft went far above what most officers would with his extensive follow-up and had he not, most likely the weapon would have never been recovered.

Officer Ryan Sweeney
Officers Johnathan Carelock and Kristopher McDowell responded to 893 N. Dawson Street on a report of a man armed with a knife. Dispatch further advised that Jose Del Akamo bit his sister on the arm and then armed himself with a kitchen knife. Upon arrival, Officer McDowell learned that the subject had retreated into the basement and was still armed with a knife. Officer Carelock immediately began speaking with Del Alamo and created a rapport, speaking from upstairs, while the subject remained in the basement. Officer Carelock requested more cars and a supervisor. Officers Richard Mervin and Ryan Sweeney and Sergeant White responded. While speaking to Mr. Akamo, Officer McDowell realized that he was clearly in a mental crisis state. The male was threatening that if officers came down into the basement, they would be carrying him out in a body bag. The officers set up an arrest team, while Officer McDowell continued to calm the subject down. Officer McDowell talked his way into the basement, and was speaking face to face with the subject. Eventually, the subject dropped the knife behind the couch and allowed Fire Rescue to come and evaluate him. In the end, the subject walked on his own to the ambulance where he was transported to the hospital for a psychological evaluation. This situation called for consistent tactical evaluation (CIT) level negotiations, and team coordination. The officer’s diligence and persistent actions led to a successful conclusion in this stand-off.
Officer Michael Allen

On November 3, 2014 at 9:20 p.m. Officer Allen observed a suspicious vehicle in the parking lot of the northeast corner of East Quincy Avenue & South Buckley Road. He established probable cause to stop the vehicle on a public street where he made a traffic stop. Officer Roberts responded as a cover officer and upon contact with the two occupants of the vehicle a distinct odor of marijuana was noted. The passenger was making furtive movements toward the floorboard. K9 Officer Exstrom and K9 Flash arrived on scene and were present while the driver was removed from the vehicle without incident. However he failed to follow orders, fought officers, and made efforts to access his waist-band and to get into a backpack. A foot chase ensued where K9 Flash apprehended him, and another violent struggle ensued where he accessed a pistol. Officers took him into custody using a great deal of restraint as a much stronger response was justified. While at the hospital for treatment of his injuries another fight ensued where K9 Sergeant Samuels assisted in getting the suspect back into custody. These officers acted in a very professional manner and exercised a tremendous amount of restraint in the arrest of a violently resisting armed suspect. Two other handguns were recovered as well as a large amount of marijuana packaged for sale. The suspects were also persons of interest in a District 2 cases involving armed robberies.

Officer Quint Cox

On July 21, 2015, Officer Quint Cox responded on a welfare check of an elderly female who lived alone at 13998 East Louisiana Place. Officer Cox discovered that Ms. Richardson lost her husband two months prior and was experiencing a number of serious difficulties as a result. She had no food in her home, could not use her telephone, and was forced to sleep on a couch since her husband’s death. Utilizing his own resources, Officer Cox went to a local grocer and purchased food items for Ms. Richardson. In addition, he resolved an issue with her telephone and made sure it was functioning before leaving. Working with victim advocates and a local retailer, Officer Cox was able to obtain a mattress for Ms. Richardson’s use. Officer Cox was awarded this Commander’s Commendation for his selfless actions to go above and beyond his duties to tend to the needs of a highly compromised individual. His continued care and concern for the citizens of Aurora has yet again been displayed with the utmost professionalism.

Officer Adam Roberts and Officer Chad Warner

On May 22, 2015, Detective Tom Wilson issued a bulletin indicating there was probable cause to arrest Kevin Onno Metze for pawning items that had been taken in a burglary the previous day. The bulletin requested that if Metze was contacted in his vehicle, the vehicle was to be impounded pending a search warrant. Officers Chad Warner and Adam Roberts recognized Metze from a contact about two weeks previous. Both officers returned to the location where they had previously contacted Metze. When they arrived, they found him sitting in his vehicle and arrested him without incident. During a search incident to the arrest, Officer Warner found a vial containing heroin. The vehicle was impounded and Metze was jailed for charges related to the stolen property, as well as possession of a schedule II controlled substance. The excellent police work by both Officers Warner and Roberts resulted in the quick arrest of a wanted felon.
Officer Jeff Brown and Officer Patrick Youngquist
On December 3, 2014, Officers Jeff Brown and Patrick Youngquist were dispatched to a medical office located in Centennial, Colorado on a report involving the abuse of an at-risk adult. The 84-year-old male victim stated that he resides at his home in Aurora with his 52-year-old son who has been abusing him for several years, and that the abuse had become progressively more severe. The victim, a retired decorated Air Force Brigadier General who served as a fighter pilot in Korea and Vietnam, sustained visible injuries allegedly caused by his son, and further reported being yelled at, spat upon and repeatedly threatened. The victim went to the doctor’s office because “he didn’t know what else to do.” Officers initiated a thorough preliminary interview of the victim and other family members; completed a detailed report; and made appropriate notifications in support of the investigation and eventual arrest of the suspect by District 3 detectives. Rather than merely taking the required report and simply routing it to detectives for follow up, Officers Brown and Youngquist took a victim-centered approach, focusing on the needs and concerns of the victim in a way that ensured a compassionate and sensitive delivery of service. Officers Brown and Youngquist were awarded this commander’s commendation for performing their duties above and beyond expectation in a manner that reflects the high quality and professionalism of the Aurora Police Department.

Officer Andrew Crowley, Officer Richard Garcia, and Officer Thomas Faustin
On January 28, 2015, a member of the Aurora Police Department’s Intelligence Unit distributed to sworn members a suspicious activity bulletin regarding a volatile adult male with mental health issues who sent an email containing threatening remarks towards the mayor, a municipal judge and officers. On January 30, 2015, Officers Richard Garcia, Andrew Crowley and Thomas Faustin were dispatched to the subject’s residence in response to a 9-1-1 call that was made by both parties who reported a physical altercation between them. The father, a self-described twenty plus years mental health professional, requested a Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) officer be sent to contact his son. A CIT officer was not available and the dispatched officers handled the call (APD 2015-3957). Each officer engaged the family members in a non-provoking manner to determine what occurred. Applying proper contact and cover principles, they kept family members apart while ensuring officer safety was maintained. The irate adult male son was calmed and eventually agreed to submit himself to be placed on a mental health hold. Officers Garcia, Crowley, and Faustin are commended for their efforts to resolve a highly volatile situation, involving a person with serious mental health concerns, in a manner that allowed him to maintain his dignity and respect and thus avoid further confrontation. Given the prior information known about the adult son, a much more aggressive or defensive approach might have taken place; however, Officers Garcia, Crowley, and Faustin took a victim centered approach. They focused on the needs and concerns of the victim in a way that ensured a compassionate and sensitive delivery of service. The father involved in the incident made a phone call to the police department, recommending that these officers receive an award. Officers Garcia, Crowley, and Faustin were, therefore, awarded a Commander’s Commendation for performance of duties in such a manner as to reflect high quality and professionalism on behalf of the agency.

Officer Thomas Eckstadt
On February 7, 2015, Officer Thomas Eckstadt was dispatched to Denver Health Medical Center on a report of a sexual assault that had occurred within the city of Aurora the day before. Officer Eckstadt
determined that the allegations of the 62-year-old female victim involved a cable repair person who responded to the victim’s Aurora home to fix her internet connection. The victim, who suffers from multiple health illnesses, had not been subjected to physical force or abuse during the alleged sexual assault. She reportedly thought about the incident overnight and decided the next day to go to the hospital to make a report. (APD Case No. 2015-5183) Officer Eckstadt initiated a preliminary interview of the victim; completed a detailed report; made appropriate notifications in support of the investigation; gained the victim’s consent to collect evidence at her home. His efforts determined the identity of the suspect which led to an eventual interview involving a Sex Crimes Unit detective. Rather than merely taking the required report and simply routing it to detectives for follow up, Officer Eckstadt took a victim centered approach which focused on the needs and concerns of the victim in a way that ensured a compassionate and sensitive delivery of service. Officer Eckstadt also recognized the importance to the community of pursuing potential suspect leads without delay. When the internet cable service provider declined to provide the identity of their technician, he vigorously used available resources to identify and locate the suspect. Officer Eckstadt was awarded this commander’s commendation for performing his duties above and beyond expectation in a manner that reflects the high quality and professionalism of the Aurora Police Department.

Officer Bridget Johnson and Officer Robin Thompson
On April 4, 2015, about 1628 hours Officers Bridget Johnson and Robin Thompson responded to an armed robbery at the Popeye’s Chicken located at 3122 S. Parker Rd. They met with the victim Erik Loera who had met with the suspects to purchase ¼ pound of marijuana. When he met the suspects they robbed him of his money by simulating a weapon and then left. As they left Erik was able to get the license plate for the car which he provided to the officers who learned the vehicle listed to an address in District 2. Later that evening Ofc. Darryl Huntsman located the suspect vehicle at the registered address. He contacted the members of the District 2 DART Team. D-2 DART along with Officers from D-1 DART and Officer Hanley from K9 conducted surveillance of the vehicle and the address. Ofc. Huntsman identified the driver though photos he found and a photo lineup was developed by Ofcs. Johnson and Thompson. The victim returned to Aurora and after viewing the lineup, identified the suspect as being the driver of the car used in the crime. After contacting a female leaving the address DART interviewed her and learned the driver was her son and she provided a name of the accomplice. Another photo line was up developed and the second suspect was also identified. Through the diligence and team work displayed by everyone involved one suspect was arrested that night and a warrant was obtained for the second suspect. The work done by Patrol, DART Teams and K9 in compiling information, speaking with the victim and making the arrest is a continual example of the high caliber of officers that comprise the Aurora Police Department. Together they all exemplify the key values of the Aurora Police Department and provided a great service to the citizens of Aurora.

Officer Dara Clodio, Officer Kenneth Forrest, Officer William Hummel
PAR and BIG officers became aware of a subject wanted on burglary warrants out of Denver during the week of August 24th, 2015. On August 26th, 2015 BIG Officer William Hummel established plain clothes surveillance on 12245 E 14th Ave which was a location connected to the wanted subject. During surveillance Officers Hummel and Clodio observed a male matching the description of the subject board an RTD bus and called for assistance as he followed the RTD bus. PAR Officer Ken Forrest responded and
made a stop on the bus at a location on S Peoria St. Both officers boarded the bus and made contact with the male who presented them with a Colorado ID in the name of another person. The officers continued to investigate and through attention to detail determined that the subject on the bus could not be the same male the ID was issued to. The officers arrested the subject on the bus and subsequently found ID on his person that verified that he was the wanted burglary offender. The officers had investigated this subject and found that the subject has an extensive criminal history and that he had a significant number of pawns including numerous lawn mowers. Northwest Aurora had been suffering a significant number of garage burglaries and the vast majority of items pawned by this offender were items commonly associated with garage storage. Since the arrest, similar burglaries essentially ceased. The officers recognized the importance of arresting this offender to prevent further crimes and actively sought him out for this reason.

Officer Eugene Colwell and Officer Matt Helfer
On September 1st, 2015 at approximately 1500 hours, Foot Patrol Officers Matt Helfer and Eugene Colwell were on their foot beat in the 9900 block of E Colfax Ave when they observed two homeless men arguing. They responded and broke up the verbal altercation between the two men. Several minutes later the Officers observed the same two men in a physical fight at the MLK Library located at 9898 E Colfax Ave. Both officers ran across the street to break up the fight, one man fled from the fight and the other remained suffering from a stab wound. The officers pursued the fleeing male and quickly learned that he had used a knife to stab the other male. Officers Colwell and Helfer quickly summoned medical assistance, secured the scene and witnesses and arrested the suspect for First Degree Assault. Officers Helfer and Colwell are a valuable resource to District 1 and the PAR unit. They already knew the individuals involved as well as witnesses and had previously established a rapport with many of them through street contacts. Their response to this dangerous incident and investigation is a testament to their knowledge of the neighborhood as Foot Patrol officers.

Sergeant Gregg Gallozzi, Officer Abdullah Syidi, and Officer Delbert Tisdale
On October 23, 2015, at about 0048 hours, Officer's Abdullah Syidi and Delbert Tisdale arrived on the scene of a reported structure fire at 1400 Kingston Street Unit 3. Once inside there was a large amount of smoke coming from inside unit #3 that filled the lower hallway and was also spreading up to the other two levels of this three-story apartment building. Officer Syidi, despite heavy smoke was able to assist Sgt. Gregg Gallozzi with getting the occupant of unit #3 out of the building and also carried out a 3-year old boy who the father did not take with him. Officer Tisdale began knocking on the doors of the nearby units, despite the presence of heavy smoke from a small kitchen fire, officers were able to warn the residents and have them leave the building until AFD arrived. The residents who were leaving the building were continuously coughing and some had to be led out of the building. Due to the quick actions of Sgt. Gallozzi and Officers Syidi and Tisdale, the buildings residents were safely evacuated resulting in no reported injuries.

Officer Jeff Olson, Officer William Stricklin, and Officer Daniel Veith
On September 5th, 2015, at about 0330 hours, Officers William Stricklin and Daniel Veith were dispatched to 441 N. Geneva Street #204 reference a welfare check. Upon arrival they contacted a security guard who advised that an extremely intoxicated male had fallen and hit his head in the parking
After falling down he got up and went into apartment #204. The officers knocked on the door and were confronted by two intoxicated and extremely belligerent males. They refused to let the officers check on the intoxicated male and began to forcefully push the door closed on Officer Stricklin. While Officer Stricklin was trying to keep the door from being closed a third male approached him and punched him in the face. Officer Veith moved up to assist and he began getting punched by one of the other suspects. All three suspects began violently attacking both officers by punching them multiple times in the face and head. Officer Jeff Olson arrived on scene and observed Officers Veith and Stricklin being attacked. He quickly responded to their aid. The officers were finally able to get two of the suspects into handcuffs but they continued to kick the officers and were out of control. The third suspect fled back into the apartment and shut the door. Officers had to kick the door open in order to take the third suspect into custody. During this assault all three officers were injured. These officers faced a very violent and unprovoked attack from three suspects. It should be noted that two of the suspects were convicted of 2nd Degree Assault on a Peace Officer, and the third was convicted of 3rd Degree Assault on a Peace Officer. Despite their injuries they maintained their composure, worked together to protect each other, and eventually got all three suspects into custody. Their actions are an excellent example of their professionalism and dedication to their fellow officers and the citizens of Aurora. Officer Jeff Olson is hereby awarded the Commander’s Commendation.

**Officer Robert Little**

On October 6, 2015, Officer Robert Little attempted to make a traffic stop on a vehicle with no headlights on in the area of E. Alameda Avenue and S. Havana Street. The vehicle did not pull over and instead sped away on E. 1st Avenue. Officer Little ceased his attempts to stop the vehicle, but was able to observe it strike multiple curbs near E. 1st Avenue and Dayton Street. The vehicle then turned into an apartment complex and parked at 171 Fulton Street. The driver, Joshua Tally, began to run south through the parking lot while carrying a backpack. Officer Little engaged this party in a foot pursuit, and was able to apprehend Mr. Tally in the parking lot with the assistance of other officers. Mr. Tally was found to be in possession of a handgun, several grams of methamphetamine and drug paraphernalia. Further, Mr. Tally had several felony warrants for his arrest. Officer Little did a tremendous job of following APD policy concerning eluding vehicles, and was able to apprehend an armed, convicted felon without incident.

**Officer Patricia Perea and Mr. Harry Budisidharta**

During 2015, Officer Patricia Perea began working closely with the Asian Pacific Development Center in her PAR area to assist in developing closer ties with a large refugee community present in the area. Officer Perea developed the idea of bringing refugee youth into the Aurora Police Explorer Program with the idea that such youth could act as ambassadors in the community and foster positive relationships with the Aurora Police Department. With the valuable assistance of Mr. Harry Budisidharta, a young man from the Bhutanese refugee community was identified as a potential candidate. Officer Perea and Mr. Budisidharta spent considerable time coordinating with the candidate and his family prior to his application to the program being submitted. The candidate's application was submitted, he passed all entry requirements, and was accepted to the Aurora Police Department Explorer Academy. The candidate started the academy on January 9th, 2016 and Officer Perea maintains close ties with him as
he progresses. This is an excellent example of community collaboration and both Mr. Budisidharta and Officer Perea should be congratulated for their efforts.

**Director of Neighborhood Services Aaron Gagne**

Annually the Aurora Police Department holds an event, National Night Out, which brings the community together. This event is a time for neighbors to meet each other and talk with their PAR officers in an informal meet and greet setting. Aurora Police Department provides food and entertainment for the kids in the area. This year, 2015, members of Community Development and Animal Control donated to the event. Without your contributions Aurora Police District 1 would not have been able to provide the amount of food to the members of the community. Aurora Police District 1 would like to thank everyone in Neighborhood Services for your donations to the event. The help you provided to District 1 for this event is truly appreciated. As National Night Out is a way for the Police Department to bring the community together, Neighborhood Services has shown the true meaning of the CORE 4 values in working with Aurora Police District 1 to make this event memorable for the community.

**Crime Analyst Jamie Newsum**

Beginning in October of 2015, the Denver Metropolitan area began to see an uptick in armed robberies of businesses. Over the course of the next four months, a group was identified and was labeled the “Mickey Mouse Bandits” due to their trademark white gloves. This group was responsible for over forty armed robberies in the Metropolitan area, with fifteen of them committed in the City of Aurora. A total of five suspects comprised the “Mickey Mouse Bandit” group. Between one to four suspects would commit each robbery, but never the entire group of five at any one time. Four out of the five suspects were identified and ultimately apprehended. The fifth suspect was unidentifiable for quite some time, until Aurora Police Department Senior Crime Analyst Jamie Newsum became involved. Jamie conducted research on Facebook, utilized an in-depth analysis of cellular telephone records as well as other investigative means in order to develop a subject that went by the moniker of “Alex.” Jamie was able to develop a suspect by the name of Abdullah Muhammed Mallett, and with the assistance of Safe Streets Task Force investigators was able to secure a Nationwide extradition warrant for Mallett’s arrest in connection to these robberies. On March 2nd, 2016, Abdullah Mallett was arrested in Tennessee, and is currently undergoing extradition back to Colorado. A full confession was obtained from Mallett in regards to his involvement with the series of robberies that were committed by the “Mickey Mouse Bandit crew.” Due to her commitment, professionalism, attention to detail and dogged determination, Senior Crime Analyst Jamie Newsum is awarded this Commander’s Commendation for a job well done. Her actions and involvement can be directly attributed in taking a dangerous felon off of the streets of our community.

**Officer Bryan Knox, Officer Clark Orchard**

On September 30, 2014 Officer Knox and Officer Clark Orchard were assisting FAST in the apprehension of a fugitive, Andrew Davis. After receiving intelligence from FAST, Officer Knox approached Davis’ room at the Radiant Inn. The front door was ajar. Based on the high risk nature of the arrest, Officer Knox immediately placed Davis at gun point as he sat stoically at the foot of the bed. Officer Knox’s orders were initially unheeded as Davis appeared to be plotting his next move. Officer Orchard recognized Davis’ intent and took immediate necessary action to change Davis’ focus. Officer Orchard painted Davis
with the laser from the taser to his chest. Officer Knox used the moment to move forward and take control of Davis and his hands. Davis eventually capitulated and was taken into custody without incident. During a search of Davis a gun was recovered from Davis’ back pocket. The weapon was checked and it was learned that the weapon was linked to a homicide in Arkansas. Officer Knox and Officer Orchard’s quick reaction to a rapidly developing dangerous situation took the initiative from Davis thereby saving the lives of on scene officers. There was no doubt that Davis was plotting a violent encounter, but was at such a disadvantage he elected to surrender.

**Officer Barry Martin**

On August 11, 2015 the Aurora SWAT team hosted an event for the United States Marshal Service. SWAT Officer Barry Martin was tasked to coordinate with the USMS agent and a private range capable of containing the ammunition to be used that day. The event was designed to test the weaknesses in an armored vehicle that had been seized during a federal criminal investigation. The vehicle was armored in a manner similar to the very vehicles that many federal law enforcement agencies use for dignitary protection. The exercise included extrication techniques and ballistic testing of differing high caliber rifle cartridges. Over the course of several months Officer Martin spent many work and personal hours to ensure this event occurred safely and achieved the intended result of the exercise. Officer Martin represented the Aurora SWAT team and our agency with professionalism and in the best possible light in the presence of our federal law enforcement colleagues.

**Acting Sergeant Phillip Rathbun**

On March 19, 2015 a victim was robbed at knifepoint of their vehicle in Glendale, Colorado. Glendale Police entered the vehicle as stolen into CCIC/NCIC with the notation of “Suspects armed and dangerous, use caution, armed with a knife”. Later that morning Aurora Police Dispatch received an alert based on the vehicles travel along the Colfax corridor. Acting Sergeant Phil Rathbun was in the area when the information about the stolen vehicle was aired. A short time later he found the vehicle near Colfax Avenue and Havana Street. The vehicle circled the block and proceeded East on Colfax Avenue. Officers attempted to stop the vehicle as it turned south on Moline Street from Colfax Avenue. The vehicle eluded officers continuing south on Moline Street. Officers engaged in a vehicle pursuit with Acting Sergeant Rathbun assuming the role of the primary car. The pursuit continued through portions of north Aurora ultimately ending up on Highway E-470 and East 56th Avenue. Acting Sergeant Rathbun sought and received permission to perform a PIT maneuver. He executed the maneuver with precision wherein the suspect vehicle slid off the roadway and into a muddy field. The two suspects were still armed and taken into custody without further incident. It was later discovered that both suspects were wanted on active warrants based on prior robberies. Throughout the pursuit, Acting Sergeant Rathbun provided clear and concise updates on the radio as to the speeds, traffic, road conditions and descriptions of the suspects. It was due to this effective communication that the Watch Commander was able to make minute-by-minute assessments of the need to continue the pursuit balanced with citizen safety concerns. Acting Sergeant Rathbun maintained the presence of mind to consider all attendant circumstances of a supervisory officer while directly involved in the pursuit. He is to be commended on his ability to assess and communicate the ongoing justification for a pursuit of two armed and dangerous offenders, bringing the incident to a safe and effective conclusion.
Officer Lonnie Crump, Officer Juan Gonzalez
On May 23, 2015 at 1030 hours, Aurora Police District 1 officers responded to a reported felony menacing call at 11297 E. Colfax Ave. Officer Williby immediately contacted the victims and obtained reliable detailed suspect information. Officer Gonzalez responded to interpret due to a language barrier. His quick response was vital to developing accurate information about the incident and suspect. After officers checked the area for the suspect, Officer Orchard, Officer Matthews and Officer Crump also responded to the victims location to assist with the investigation. While on scene the victim pointed out the suspect near the Park Motel. At the same time, a female motel employee exited the building between the suspect and officers. Officer Williby, Officer Orchard and Officer Gonzalez attempted contact with the suspect by giving orders. The suspect reached into his coat pocket and pulled out a firearm. The suspect immediately laid the firearm on the ground. The officers recognized the suspect was giving up and not threatening them with the gun. They also saw the female in their line of fire. The officers utilized great poise and restraint in resolving this high risk situation without the use of deadly force. After the suspect was taken into custody, Officer Matthews obtained a confession under Miranda. Officer Crump assisted in coordinating the investigation. Officer Williby and Officer Orchard collected evidence and interviewed witnesses and victims. The suspect was arrested for felony menacing and was later charged with POWPO. The initial response, arrest, investigation, and evidence collection were all completed in an exemplary manner. The initiative, hard-work, and investigative prowess displayed by these officers is to be commended. They exemplify the key values of the Aurora Police Department and provided a great service to the citizens of Aurora.

Officer Levi Huffine and Officer Brian O’Halloran
On March 7, 2015, at approximately 2:30 a.m., Officers Levi Huffine and Brian O’Halloran responded to an alarm at the Subway Restaurant located at 13692 E. Iliff Avenue. Officers Huffine and O’Halloran immediately noticed that the rear door of the building was open, and approached this area with caution. The officers then confronted two juvenile suspects who had burglarized the business and were now inside of the restaurant. The suspects fled the scene through the front door of the Subway and ran to the southwest. Officers Huffine and O’Halloran quickly asked for a perimeter to be set up, and were soon assisted by officers from all three districts. An accurate description of the subjects was aired during this time, and Officers Huffine and O’Halloran adeptly used these additional resources to set up an effective search zone. As a result of the quick perimeter and tenacity of Officers Huffine and O’Halloran, the burglary suspects were taken into police custody a short time later. Officers O’Halloran and Huffine should be commended for their quick response to the business alarm, and use of sound tactics during this incident.

Officer Keith Matthews, Officer Clark Orchard, and Machelle Williby
On May 23, 2015 at 1030 hours, Aurora Police District 1 officers responded to a reported felony menacing call at 11297 E. Colfax Ave. Officer Williby immediately contacted the victims and obtained reliable detailed suspect information. Officer Gonzalez responded to interpret due to a language barrier. His quick response was vital to developing accurate information about the incident and suspect. After officers checked the area for the suspect, Officer Orchard, Officer Matthews and Officer Crump also responded to the victims location to assist with the investigation. While on scene the victim pointed out the suspect near the Park Motel. At the same time, a female motel employee exited the
building between the suspect and officers. Officer Williby, Officer Orchard and Officer Gonzalez attempted contact with the suspect by giving orders. The suspect reached into his coat pocket and pulled out a firearm. The suspect immediately laid the firearm on the ground. The officers recognized the suspect was giving up and not threatening them with the gun. They also saw the female in their line of fire. The officers utilized great poise and restraint in resolving this high risk situation without the use of deadly force. After the suspect was taken into custody, Officer Matthews obtained a confession under Miranda. Officer Crump assisted in coordinating the investigation. Officer Williby and Officer Orchard collected evidence and interviewed witnesses and victims. The suspect was arrested for felony menacing and was later charged with POWPO. The initial response, arrest, investigation, and evidence collection were all completed in an exemplary manner. The initiative, hard-work, and investigative prowess displayed by these officers is to be commended. They exemplify the key values of the Aurora Police Department and provided a great service to the citizens of Aurora.

Officer Gary Oliver

On March 30, 2015 Officer Gary Oliver responded to Legend Oak Apartments on a theft report of an IPAD. A suspect entered the workout room of the complex and stole an IPAD. Officer Oliver reviewed the video and knew the suspect matched the description of a previous call. Officer Oliver tracked the IPAD down to 2311 S. Jamaica St. Officer Oliver obtained consent from the homeowner to enter the property and look for the IPAD. He located the suspect and located the stolen IPAD in the back alley. Officer Oliver unraveled more than a theft but an actual burglary through perseverance of solving this crime. Officer Gary Oliver through his own efforts and professionalism tracked this suspect down and was awarded the Commander’s Commendation.

Officer Mark Simmerman and Officer Christopher Mowry

On August 12, 2014, at about 8:20 pm, District 1 patrol responded to the area of I-225 SB HWY @ E. 6th Ave on a report of a male sitting on the bridge looking like he was going to jump off. Officers arrived to find a 21 year old adult male sitting on the I-225 bridge over the E. 6th Ave. eastbound lanes. He had climbed over the small chain link fence atop the concrete guard rail with the intentions of jumping off to commit suicide. Officer Paul Cancino, CIT trained, arrived and immediately began talking with the subject. SWAT Officers Brant Harrold and Paul Jerothe quickly set up on the bridge directly behind the subject and tied ropes around their waist, securing it to a police truck in the event they had to grab onto the suicidal subject. Officer Cancino continued to talk with the subject as he kept making suicidal threats of jumping. A plan was made that if the opportunity presented itself Officers Harrold and Jerothe would grab onto the male and pull him over the fence. Officers Mark Simmerman and Christopher Mowry were instructed to assist Officers Harrold and Jerothe by grabbing their belts should they have to jump over the fence. At one point the subject raised his arms and placed them on top of the fence making it possible to grab and secure him. Officers Harrold and Jerothe quickly jumped up on the guardrail, reached over the fence, and grabbed onto the subject’s arms. When the rescue was conducted Officers Simmerman, Mowry and Sgt. J. Martinez all grabbed onto Officers Harrold and Jerothe to keep them from going too far over the fence, they then assisted with securing the resisting subject and successfully controlled him on the ground so he could be treated by AFD Paramedics. The male resisted the officers, making his body go limp, but was successfully pulled up and over the fence to safety. All the officers performed a difficult task, making a split second decision, putting themselves at risk several stories
above E. 6th Avenue. The officers' actions contributed in keeping the subject from jumping off the overpass in full view of the public, as the fall certainly would have caused serious injury or death.

**Officer Joseph Sullivan**

On July 21, 2015 officers were dispatched to Aurora Mental Health on a report of a possible homicidal subject. Upon arrival staff stated that the subject rated a 9 out of 10 on their scale of being psychotic. Staff also stated that he was currently highly hostile and exploded in anger when he was told by the on duty Psychiatrist that he was being put on a mandatory mental health hold for further evaluation. Officer Joseph Sullivan, who is C.I.T trained, arrived on scene and started to converse with the subject who was unstable and anxious because of the police presence. Officer Sullivan was calm and patient while talking with the subject. Officer Sullivan built a rapport with the subject and explained to him the importance of the hold and the reason for the hold. Officer Sullivan was able to get the subject to voluntarily get up and walk to the ambulance to be transported to the hospital. Officer Joseph Sullivan exercised great professionalism and genuine concern for the subject and through his actions prevented a possible violent and dangerous altercation from taking place including possible injuries to officers or the subject himself.

**Sergeant Graham Dunne**

On December 9, 2014 at 1249 hours, Sgt. Dunne became aware of a stolen vehicle that was eastbound on E. Colfax Av. and Moline St. Approximately five minutes later, Sgt. Dunne observed the vehicle westbound on E. Colfax Av. at Peoria St. Sgt. Dunne began following the vehicle and asking for assist cars. Sgt. Dunne was also alerted by the BOSS LPR System that the vehicle was taken in a Denver robbery and that the occupants were possibly armed. Sgt. Dunne followed the vehicle to the 1400 block of Moline St. where a pursuit began and the vehicle eluded him. Sgt. Dunne was able to observe the vehicle driving north on Del Mar Pkwy where it eventually crashed in the 1200 block. The driver fled and Sgt. Dunne pursued him for a block where he was taken into custody without incident. It should be noted that a full confession to the robbery and eluding were obtained and a stolen shotgun was recovered from the vehicle.

**Officer Roland Albert, Officer Jeremiah Cooley, Officer Paul Davis, Officer Chad Elliott, Officer Steve Ficco, Officer W.B. Martin, Officer Dan Pell, and Officer Scott Wicklund**

On December 30, 2014 at about 11:30 pm, two citizens were robbed at gunpoint of their truck near 1725 N. Peoria St. Two of the suspects were armed and pointed their weapons at the victims. DART Officers Paul Davis and Chad Elliott quickly located the truck a short distance away. The stolen truck was mobile and occupied by three suspects. Officers Elliott, Davis, Steve Ficco and W.B. Martin began to coordinate a plan to effectively take the suspects into custody. DART Officers Roland Albert, Daniel Pell, Jeremy Cooley and Scott Wicklund heard the tactical arrest being organized and responded to assist. Using unmarked police vehicles, the DART Officers immobilized the suspect vehicle in the 1900 block of N. Galena St. The driver made an intense effort to escape by accelerating back and forth in the stolen truck against the DART vehicles. While this was occurring, the officers tasked with taking physical custody of the occupants worked to seize the driver and stop his assaultive actions. As these officers shouted commands at the occupants, the driver made a motion to the lower right side of his body and into the seat crease, increasing the intensity of the situation. Eventually, the suspects were compelled
to surrender and were taken into custody without injury and only minor damage to the stolen truck. A loaded handgun was located under the armrest of the front seat and a second loaded handgun was located under passenger front seat. This fluid and dynamic coordinated tactical effort by these DART officers bears proof of the training and experience wielded by this elite group, which led to the successful arrest of these extremely dangerous criminals.
Automated Complaint and Commendation Report

The Automated Complaint and Commendation System accepts and records all submissions. The Department designed the system to manage the complaints and commendations reported on sworn personnel.

During 2015, there were 267 complaints received online or entered by a Police Department member that involved 349 sworn members and 8 non-sworn members.

Additionally, thirty-six (36) commendations were received for sworn officers. There were zero (0) commendations submitted for non-sworn members of the Department.
Automated Complaints by Type

The Automated Complaint System categorizes the submissions for the Department to analyze, determine trends and provide instruction if needed.

The system categorize the complaints received during 2015, as follows: Three (3) alleging an illegal search. Zero (0) reported neglect of duty, fifty-six (56) reported violations of court issues or missed court, zero (0) reported violations of Constitutional rights, three (3) allegations of unsatisfactory performance, five (5) allegations of racial profiling, twenty-one (21) reports of excessive use of force, thirty (30) complaints of improper or incomplete investigations, fifty-six (56) for other directives or SOPs not captured under the other types and eighty-eight (88) complaints of rudeness or professionalism issues.
Automated Complaints by Validity

In each of the complaint submissions received, the officer’s supervisor has investigated the complaint. The officer’s chain of command has reviewed the investigations before closing them.

The Department has reviewed each of the complaints and analyzed the validity of the complaint. From these there were seventy-five (75) sustained, forty-three (43) not sustained, One-hundred-forty-six (146) unfounded, forty-five (45) within policy, two (2) misunderstandings, and forty-four (44) unknown due to unresponsive complainants.
Automated Complaints, Results

The Automated Complaint System records any corrective action taken by the Department as a result of the investigation. The results range from “none justified” to an order by the Chief to the Internal Affairs Section to formally investigate the complaint. Careful study and comparison of this information will reveal that more incidents result in some form of correction than incidents that are found to be valid. This is because the complaint may not be valid in light of the Department Directives, but the supervisor may determine the officer needs some degree of instruction to help him/her do a better job.

The results of the complaints submitted are as follows in descending order of severity. The Chief of Police ordered the Internal Affairs Section to formally investigate forty-one (41) members. The Department issued ten (10) Written Reprimands for violations of Department Directives. A Written Reprimand is permanent discipline that remain in the officer’s file for his/her entire career. The Department issued twenty-one (21) Corrective Action Reports instructing the officers to change their behavior. The Corrective Action Report is not discipline but a notice or warning to modify behavior. The Corrective Action Report remains in the officer’s file for one to two years, depending on his/her evaluation date and cycle. It is documentation of past problems and corrective measures taken if the officer repeats the behavior. The officer’s supervisors issued thirty-one (31) Performance Appraisal Entry (PAE) reports documenting negative performance. The supervisors use the PAE reports as documentation and are included in the officers’ annual evaluations. On fifteen (15) occasions the supervisors verbally counseled the officers. Thirteen (13) complaints were referred to mediation. The supervisors completed seventeen (17) Performance Appraisal Entry reports that were to document the investigation only (nothing negative toward the officer). The Department concluded in two-hundred-twenty-four (224) of the complaints that the complaint was not valid and that no documentation was needed.
Automated Complaints, Follow Up Contact Method

At the conclusion of the investigation the supervisor is required, if possible, to contact the complainant and explain the findings. The Automated Complaint System records show the supervisor contacted that person.

The supervisors contacted the complainant by telephone in one hundred seventeen (117) of the cases. The supervisors used e-mail sixty-nine (69) times. In thirty-five (35) cases, the supervisor could not contact the complainant (anonymous complaint or attempted but unable to contact). The supervisor met the complainant in person forty-one (41) times.

Automated Complaints Follow Up Contact Method

- **Phone (117)**
- **E-mail (69)**
- **Unable to Contact (35)**
- **In Person (41)**
Automated Commendations by Type

The system categorized the thirty-six (36) commendations received during 2015 as follows:

Eight (8) citizen submissions expressed appreciation for the officer. Six (6) others reported a job well done. One (1) submission stated the officer was professional. Four (4) reported the officer went above and beyond expectations and seventeen (17) expressed a thank you.
Automated Complaint and Commendation System, Miscellaneous Information on People Reporting

The automated complaint and commendation system allows the submitting person the opportunity to provide information about himself/herself. The system has a drop-down menu giving the person a choice of options to describe himself/herself. Eighty-one (81) of the people submitting a complaint or commendation indicated they were a citizen of Aurora. Thirty (30) indicated they were a non-resident. Twenty-eight (28) said they were an employee member of the Department, and forty-nine (49) indicated they were a government official.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of People</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Official</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Pie chart showing the distribution of people submitting commendation and complaints]
Gender of People Submitting Commendations and Complaints

- Male (147) - 55%
- Female (101) - 38%
- Unknown Gender (18) - 7%

Reported Ethnicity of People Submitting Commendations and Complaints

- White (89) - 48%
- African American (38) - 34%
- Latino (7) - 15%
- Asian (0) - 3%
- American Indian (0) - 0%
- Arab (0) - >1%
- Unknown (124) - >1%
District and Bureau Discipline Report

During 2015, the Department completed and finalized nineteen (19) District / Bureau investigations. Each resulted in the Chief of Police ordering a Written Reprimand as discipline for the violation of one or more Department Directives. A Written Reprimand is permanent discipline that remain in the employee’s file for his/her career. The following is a summary of these cases for 2015.

Chief Metz and the Aurora Police Department recognize the individual members of the Aurora Police Department have a right to privacy in the contents of their personnel files and expect the contents of these files will be held in confidence by their employer. This expectation and right to privacy flows from the United States Constitution, the Colorado Constitution, the Colorado Open Records Act, Colorado Revised Statutes § 24-72-201, et. seq., the Colorado Criminal Justice Records Act, Colorado Revised Statutes, § 24-72-301, et. seq., the City of Aurora Personnel Policies and Procedures, and the Aurora Police Department Directives. While there is little, if any, public interest in investigations stemming from allegations relating to purely administrative matters such as the use of equipment, abuse of leave and the like, these matters are nonetheless provided below.

Further, the City of Aurora also maintains the right to withhold its deliberative process as confidential. The following summaries are included with these privileges of confidentiality in mind. The following summaries do not constitute a waiver of either the individual employee’s expectation of privacy in the contents of his/her personnel file, nor waiver of the City of Aurora’s right to withhold its deliberative process as confidential.

The Department has categorized these nineteen (19) cases as follows: Six (6) cases involved members not following Department policies for vehicle operations and/or the Department’s emergency response policy. Four (4) cases were for unsatisfactory performance. Three (3) cases involved issues of professional conduct. One (1) case involved department equipment. One (1) case involved the handling of evidence. Two (2) cases involved lawful orders. One (1) case involved incidents that require notification. One (1) case involved responsibility for preliminary investigations.

The nineteen (19) District/Bureau written reprimands involved twenty-six (26) members and were issued to sixteen (16) officers and three (3) agents.

These matters that resulted in written reprimands are summarized with more detail below.
1) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.1.3 Vehicle Operation.

While responding to an alarm at a car dealership the officer looked down at his MDC upon his arrival to the location. While looking down the officer drove his patrol car over a concrete island and ran over a sign. This caused damage to the sign and minor damage to the patrol car.

2) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 5.4.1 Incidents that Require Notification and Reporting.

While off-duty and in plain clothes, the officer became involved in an altercation with an unknown person on the highway in Denver. The altercation escalated to the point where the officer felt he was in imminent fear of serious bodily injury or death. The officer verbally identified himself as an APD officer, displayed his badge and pointed his duty weapon at the unknown person who eventually retreated back to his vehicle and drove away. The officer failed to report this incident as soon as practical to his chain of command.

3) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance.

While training in the Academy, the recruit officer failed 3 geography tests.

4) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance.

Since 2008 and Agent has been unable to work his caseload in an appropriate time, having many open and overdue cases. He has been counseled and taken off rotation for new cases many times. He has received a Corrective Action and an “Improvement Needed” on his evaluation. Despite all this, the Agent was not able to get his cases under control.

5) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.1.3 Vehicle Operation.

An Officer was driving routinely, ran a red light and collided with another vehicle. The accident was preventable.

6) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility.

A firearm was found by the cleaning crew at the Arapahoe County Courthouse in the women’s bathroom. The weapon was found on top of the toilet paper dispenser and a magazine of ammunition was on top of the firearm. Maintenance notified the sheriff’s department who then took custody of the items. At about the same time, an agent arrived home and realized the weapon was missing. The agent remembered leaving it in the bathroom at the courthouse. The agent then notified a colleague at the courthouse who in turn notified the sheriff’s office. The agent coordinated the recovery of the items with the sheriff’s office.

7) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance.
While training in the Academy, the recruit officer failed 3 geography tests.

8) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.1.3 Vehicle Operation.

While driving, the officer became distracted when running a license plate of the vehicle’s MDC. The vehicle drifted and struck a raised concrete median, flattening both left side tires, damaging them beyond use and consequently causing damage to the vehicle’s front end. A Command review determined this accident was preventable.

9) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 10.9.2 Harassment, 14.1.1 Lawful Order, and 14.3.2 Conduct Towards Superior and Subordinate Officer and Associates.

This officer confronted another officer in a hostile manner, which nearly came to blows, over an incident that took place the night before. The officers made physical contact with each other while traversing the staircase in opposite directions. This officer felt that physical contact may have been intentional due to an ongoing feud between the two officers. The officer’s sergeants intervened after a string of increasingly antagonistic e-mails. They were ordered to cease and desist their mutually provocative behavior and to comply with directives however, the behavior continued.

10) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 10.9.2 Harassment, 14.1.1 Lawful Order, 14.3.2 Conduct Towards Superior and Subordinate Officer and Associates and 17.2.2 Unauthorized Use of CAD and MDC Systems.

This officer was confronted by another officer in a hostile manner, which nearly came to blows, over an incident that took place the night before. The officers made physical contact with each other while traversing the staircase in opposite directions. The other officer felt that physical contact may have been intentional due to an ongoing feud between the two officers. The officer’s sergeants intervened after a string of increasingly antagonistic e-mails. They were ordered to cease and desist their mutually provocative behavior and to comply with directives however, the behavior continued.

11) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.6 Issuance of Equipment, Badges and Identification Cards.

The officer lost/misplaced her ID card, building pass and P.O.S.T ID card.

12) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance.

While training in the Academy, the recruit officer failed 3 geography tests.

13) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.2.8 Authorized Use of Police Pursuits.
The officer was dispatched to investigate a hit and run. Upon arrival, a witness pointed out the suspect vehicle as it passed the scene. The officer attempted to stop the vehicle and the suspect failed to yield and continued to drive around the neighborhood. Initially the suspect was driving at reasonable speeds but then drove the vehicle through a yard and nearly struck another patrol car. He then accelerated and began to flee. A sergeant aired on the police radio to “let him go” but the officer continued his efforts to pull him over. The sergeant again aired to “let him go.” The suspect made clear and unmistakable efforts to elude officers and the only charges at the time the suspect engaged in fleeing was traffic related and had not met the requirements to warrant a pursuit.

14) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.9.2 Responsibility for Handling or Depositing Evidence and Other Property.

Officers responded to a report of a suicidal party. The male was taken into custody. The officer took control of the subject’s cell phone, which had been removed from his hand by one of the other officers. As the subject was being led to an ambulance, and while in handcuffs, the subject began to resist. The officer set the subject’s cell phone down on the ground outside the residence to assist the other officers with the subject. The subject was transported to the hospital and officers secured the residence and left. The officer assumed someone else on scene would secure the phone but they did not. The officer was the last to have possession of the phone and it was the officer’s responsibility to ensure that it was properly secured and returned to the subject.

15) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility and 14.3.10 Reporting Responsibility.

The officer entered inappropriate and offensive narrative regarding the fire department into an official police record.

16) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 6.11.2 Responsibility for Preliminary Investigations and 8.10.11 Traffic Accident Reports.

The officer was dispatched to a call of an accident. Upon arrival he contacted the involved parties and inspected the vehicles. The officer estimated the damage to be less than $1,000 and encouraged the parties to exchange information. One of the involved parties contacted an agent, which is a neighbor and inquired about the handling of the accident. It was determined by the agent that the vehicle suffered major damage and, from the photographs, would require several thousands of dollars to repair. The officer did not properly investigate the accident and brought discredit to the Department.

17) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 6.11.2 Responsibility for Preliminary Investigations, 6.9 Domestic Violence, and 6.9.2 Enforcement Guidelines.

This officer was dispatched to a domestic violence complaint. He contacted the victim and interviewed her. During the interview, the officer gathered enough information to establish probable cause. But, it wasn’t until later when other officers were doing follow-up that it was discovered the primary officer’s investigation and report were severely lacking.
18) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.1 Routine Police Vehicle Operations.

This officer was involved in a preventable motor vehicle accident causing damage to a city owned vehicle when it struck a parking structure support pillar. This is the second preventable accident this officer has been involved in during a six-month period.

19) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility.

The detective sent an email to another organization that was inappropriate and hindered the working relationship between the detective and another members of the APD.
Formal Internal Investigations and Discipline Report

During 2015, the Department completed and finalized twenty-seven (27) formal internal investigations. The following is a summary of the cases resolved in 2015.

Chief Metz and the Aurora Police Department recognize the individual members of the Aurora Police Department have a right to privacy in the contents of their personnel files, including the results of formal investigations and incidents of discipline, and expect the contents of these files will be held in confidence by their employer. This expectation and right to privacy flows from the United States Constitution, the Colorado Constitution, the Colorado Open Records Act, Colorado Revised Statute, § 24-72-201, et. Seq., the Colorado Criminal Justice Records Act, Colorado Revised Statutes § 24-72-301. et. Seq., the City of Aurora Personnel Policies and Procedures, and the Aurora Police Department Directives.

Further, the City of Aurora also maintains the right to withhold its deliberative process as confidential. The following summaries are included below with these privileges of confidentiality in mind. The inclusion of the following summaries does not constitute a waiver of either the individual employee’s expectation of privacy in the contents of his/her personnel files, nor waiver of the City of Aurora’s right to withhold its deliberative process as confidential. In an effort to balance the privacy and confidentiality rights of the individual officers, retaining the deliberative process privilege associated with the decision making detailed below, while at the same time providing our citizens with sufficient information to evaluate the adequacy, thoroughness and impartiality of the Aurora Police Department’s internal investigation and disciplinary process, the following information is provided:

Summary

The Department conducted and resolved twenty-seven (27) formal Internal Affairs investigations in 2015 involving forty-five (45) department members. These members consisted of one (1) civilian, thirty-four (34) officers, one (1) agent, eight (8) sergeants, and one (1) lieutenant. The discipline included fourteen (14) suspensions without pay, five (5) written reprimands, and one (1) member was fined. Two (2) members resigned or retired before discipline was issued. One (1) member was terminated. The Department cleared twenty-two (22) members of any wrongdoing; either by findings of compliance, exoneration, or they were not sustained.
1) The Department initiated an internal investigation of 8 Officers and 1 Sergeant for possible violations of 1.4.11 Supervisor Responsibility: Accountability for Performance of Subordinates, 6.1.12 Incidents Involving a Bail Bondsman, 8.10.2 MDC Reports, 14.2.9 Constitutional Requirements, 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance, and 17.2.2 Unauthorized Use of CAD and MDC Systems. All members were Not Sustained.

Officers responded to a dispatched call of an armed, wanted party in a vehicle driving southbound on S. Parker Road. A high-risk stop was conducted on the vehicle. Two occupants of the vehicle were handcuffed and detained on scene. It was later determined that the reporting party was an agent of a bail bondsman and that neither of the occupants of the vehicle was the wanted party. Thirteen months later, a lawsuit was filed by the two occupants. After the lawsuit was filed, it was discovered that no documentation existed for the stop or the detention of the two occupants.

2) The Department initiated an internal investigation for possible violation of directives 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility, 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance, 6.11.2 Responsibility for Preliminary Investigations, and 1.4.11 Supervisor Responsibility: Accountability for Performance of Subordinates. One officer was sustained for 6.11.2 and received a written reprimand. One officer was not sustained. Both sergeants were sustained on 14.3, 14.3.1, and 6.11.2 and both received a 10-hour suspension.

Two sergeants and two officers responded to a reported physical and verbal altercation. Once on scene the sergeants and officers learned that four people were involved included two off-duty Denver Police officers. The investigation revealed that all four of the parties had been drinking, a fight ensued, one of the DPD officers threatened the other with a handgun, and one of the parties left on foot while the other drove home. One drove back to the scene after APD personnel were on scene. An APD member drove the subject home where they discovered two young children sleeping and that they had been alone. It was decided that no charges would be filed at the time of the initial investigation.

3) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility, 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance, and 8.9.2 Responsibility for Handling and Depositing Evidence. The member received a 40-hour suspension.

The Officer was dispatched to a report of a found handgun. The officer allowed the reporting party to keep possession of the weapon which contained a law enforcement only magazine. It was discovered later by another officer on an un-related call that the pistol was reported stolen.

4) The Department investigated a sworn member for possible violations of Department Directives 2.8 Duty Status of Members, 8.12.3 Requirements/Limitations of Sworn members Engaged in Secondary Employment, 8.12.4 Secondary Employment – Restrictions, 8.12.5 Secondary Employment – Selection Procedures, 8.12.6 Secondary Employment – Authorization Procedures, and 14.3.5 Neglect of Duty. The sergeant was sustained for violating 8.12.3 and 8.12.6 and he received a Written Reprimand.

The sergeant worked more than directives allowed in a 1-week period numerous times. He also failed to find a fill-in officer for a secondary employment job.
5) The Department investigated a sworn member for possible violations of Department Directive 14.3.3 Making a False or Untruthful Declaration and Standard Operating Procedure PAT 4.2.10 Cleanliness. The member was sustained on the SOP and received a Written Reprimand.

An officer checked out a marked patrol unit at the start of his shift and found what appeared to be vomit inside the vehicle. The mess was reported to a supervisor and a preliminary investigation was conducted. The last officer that occupied the vehicle offered an explanation for the mess, that it could have been from a bottle of food he discarded out the passenger window but missed and it fell to the floor causing the contents to spill out.

6) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 8.3 Court, 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility, 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance, and 14.3.5 Neglect of Duty. The member received a 10-hour suspension.

During a 1 year period, on multiple occasions, the officer arrived late or called in sick when under subpoena from Aurora Municipal Court.

7) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 5.1.7 Other Unauthorized Firing of a Weapon Situations. The member received a 10-hour suspension.

Officer was in the process of cleaning his department issued rifle in the cleaning shed when he discharged his rifle one time into the cleaning bench. He had pressed the trigger during tear-down of the rifle and had failed to check the chamber for a live round. He did not intend to discharge the rifle. No other people were present when the rifle discharged and no one was injured.

8) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance. The member received a 10-hour suspension.

While contacting an at-fault driver in an accident, the officer informed the driver to get back to the military base by driving on the side of the road. The officer was also not familiar with Colorado Revised Statute regarding dependents of military personnel in regards to driver’s licenses.

9) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 6.11.2 Responsibility for Preliminary Investigations and 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance. The member received a Written Reprimand.

The officer responded to a nursing home to investigate a reported “indecent exposure.” The reporting party advised there was two incidents of sexual misconduct by the suspect. The officer spoke only with the reporting party and did not request or obtain victim or witness information which was available and necessary to conduct and efficient and reasonable preliminary investigation. The officer was able to locate the suspect but failed to complete a check of his criminal history. This routine step would have revealed a pattern of similar sexual misconduct. A trespass notice was issued when criminal charges should have been considered.

10) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.3 Professional Conduct and 17.5.8 Police Radio Protocol. The member received a 160-hour suspension.
The officer unknowingly had an open mic on his car radio. During a period less than a minute he was heard on the open mic saying several inappropriate words and phrases. The officer admitted to saying the phrases and words, but said he did not intend to have it heard on his open mic.

11) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.2.4 Intervention. The member received a 30-hour suspension.

While the sergeant was assigned to Internal Affairs as an investigator, he became aware of confidential information regarding an internal investigation that was being conducted on another sergeant. He then took it upon himself to call the sergeant at his residence and advise him he was being investigated.

12) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3.4 Dissemination of Information. The member was not sustained.

This sergeant initiated a traffic stop on subjects possibly related to a political campaign. Later, the Chief’s office received phone calls from the media reference the stop in question.

13) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.6.5 Use of Department Equipment. The officer was fined $1,500.

The officer lost and never recovered her department issued MDC.

14) The Department investigated a sworn member involved in a shooting. This is standard practice in any officer-involved shooting. Directives reviewed for compliance were Directives 5.1.2 Authorized Use of Deadly or Potentially Deadly Force, 5.5.15 Ammunition, 5.5.16 Weapon Inspection and Registration, 7.3.2 Firearms Qualification, 7.3.4 Semi-Automatic Weapons Training, and 14.5.8 Critical Incident Drug/Alcohol Testing. The officer was found to be in compliance with all directives reviewed.

Officers conducted a traffic stop where the driver opened fire on two officers, critically injuring one. Officer then returned fire in defense of his partner’s life.

15) The Department investigated sworn members, 3 officers, 2 sergeants, and 1 lieutenant for violating Department Directives 5.3 Use of Physical Force, 5.4.9 Report Responsibilities of Supervisory Officer Notified, 8.10.13 Supervisory/Command Review of Reports, 14.2.9 Constitutional Requirements, and 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance. No members were sustained.

Three officers conducted a traffic stop on two individuals who were uncooperative with police. Officers took the suspects into custody. A hobble was used on one suspect but it was never documented by the first line sergeant or duty lieutenant.

16) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 5.3 Use of Physical Force. The member received 40-hours suspension and additional training.

The officer was involved in processing an arrestee at the Aurora Municipal Jail. The officer was tasked with completing the prisoner property inventory and the arrestee was uncooperative. The
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officer placed himself in a position of disadvantage that allowed the arrestee to kick the officer in the face. The officer responded by delivering an immediate punch to the arrestee’s face.

17) The Department started an investigation on a sworn member for possible violations of Department Directive 2.8.7 Fitness for Duty and Aurora Policy 3-27 Employee Medical Leave.

The officer medically retired before the investigation was concluded.

18) The Department investigated a sworn member involved in a shooting. This is standard practice in any officer-involved shooting. Directives reviewed for compliance were 5.1.2 Authorized Use of Deadly or Potentially Deadly Force, 5.5.15 Ammunition, 5.5.16 Weapon Inspection and Registration, 7.3.2 Firearms Qualification, and 14.5.8 Critical Incident Drug/Alcohol Testing. The officer was found to be in compliance with all directives reviewed.

Officers responded to a shots fired call. Upon arrival this officer was flagged down by a witness and pointed to an individual in an open courtyard of an apartment building. The officer observed the male subject fire a handgun numerous times. The officer made his presence known to the subject, who then turned toward the officer. Fearing for his safety, the officer fired one round at the subject striking him in the neck. The subject was apprehended and transported to the hospital.

19) The Department investigated sworn members, 2 officers, for violating Department Directives 6.11.2 Responsibility for Preliminary Investigations, 8.10.3 General Offense Reports, 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility. One member was sustained on 6.11.2 and 8.10.3. The member received a 10-hour suspension.

Officers responded to a disturbance between a landlord and a tenant. Officers deescalated the situation and cleared the call via CAD notes. No case report was taken. The RP called back the next day and spoke to a sergeant who determined more information needed to be added reference the call.

20) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.3.3 Making a False or Untruthful Declaration and 14.3.7 Leave, Illness and Injury. The member resigned before any formal discipline.

Officer was scheduled to work but called in sick and then was seen by a supervisor at a Bronco game that same night.

21) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directives 8.9.2 Responsibility for Handling or Depositing Evidence and Other Property, 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance, and 14.3.3 Making a False or Untruthful Declaration. The member was sustained on directive 8.9.2 and received a written reprimand.

This officer made an arrest and lost a motor vehicle title which belonged to the arrestee.

22) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.1.5 Conformance to Law and 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility. The member received a 20-hour suspension.
This officer was issued a traffic citation by CSP. Subject pled guilty in court to a lesser charge which resulted in 8 points being assessed on his driver’s license.

23) The Department investigated a civilian member for violating Department Directives 3.2.3 Crime Lab Section, 8.9.2 Responsibility for Handling or Depositing Evidence and Other Property, 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility, 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance, and 14.3.2 Conduct Towards Superior and Subordinate Officers and Associates. The member was sustained on 8.9.2, 14.3, 14.3.1, and 14.3.2. The member received a 40-hour suspension.

This civilian responded to a crime scene to assist patrol and was rude and unprofessional.

24) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.1.6 Conformance to Directives, 14.3.3 Making a False or Untruthful Declaration, and 14.3.7 Leave, Illness and Injury. The member was sustained and received an 80-hour suspension.

This agent had requested a day off work and was denied due to minimum staffing and short notice. The agent called in sick anyways and admitted to being at a ski resort.

25) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directives 4.1.2 Seat Belts, 4.1.3 Vehicle Operation, and 8.12.2 Responsibilities of Sworn Members Engaged in Secondary Employment. The member was sustained and received a 10-hour suspension.

This officer was involved in a traffic accident while working an off-duty job and did not get the proper approval to use the vehicle during secondary employment.

26) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3.3 Making a False or Untruthful Declaration and the City of Aurora Policy and Procedure Manual 4-2 C Just Cause. The allegations were unfounded.

It was alleged that a lateral police officer potentially engaged in misconduct during the hiring process for selection to the Aurora Police Department.

27) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance and Aurora Policy Manual 3-27 Employee Medical Leave. The member was sustained and was terminated.

This officer was on injury leave for longer than the allotted timeframe.
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Introduction

In conjunction with our core values of integrity, honor and duty, the Aurora Police Department strives for professionalism in the performance of our duties. We encourage positive behavior in our employees by use of awards and commendations. We also encourage our employees and citizens to report any perceived misconduct by our officers. We investigate every complaint and concern reported to the Department and take appropriate action, protecting the rights of the citizen and the Department member. This report reflects our commitment to openness and transparency to the people we serve.

The Department has two systems to award outstanding performance and three systems to manage complaints and discipline. The two award systems are Formal Department Awards and Informal Commander’s Commendations. The three systems used to manage complaints and disciplines are: the Automated Complaint and Commendation System; District / Bureau Discipline; and Formal Internal Investigations and Discipline.

Formal Department Awards

All employees of the Department who become aware of outstanding performance are encouraged to nominate employees and citizens for recognition through the Formal Department Awards program. Department Directive 10.7 describes the guidelines for these awards. See the Directive at the end of this report under the “Department Directives Cited in this Report” section. The Awards Board reviews and investigates all nominations for formal awards and then makes a recommendation to the Chief of Police. The Chief of Police makes the final decision on the appropriateness of each award. Awards available under the Formal Department Awards program are: Medal of Honor; Distinguished Service Cross; Purple Heart; Life Saving Award; Meritorious Service Ribbon; Chief’s Commendation Certificate; Chief’s Unit Citation; Community Commitment Certificate; and the Certificate of Appreciation – Citizen’s Award. These awards are described in the Formal Department Awards section of this report.

Informal Commander’s Commendations

Any Command Level Officer may, without a nomination to the Awards Board, award a Commander’s Commendation Certificate. The Informal Commander’s Commendations section of this report describes the certificate.

Automated Complaint and Commendation System

The Aurora Police Department created the Automated Complaint and Commendation System in 2006 to manage the investigations of and record all complaints and commendations received on sworn officers of the Department. Regardless of how received, all complaints and commendations are entered into the automated system.

Citizens can enter their complaint or commendation directly online through the City’s website. If the Department receives a complaint or commendation in person, on the telephone or in writing, the receiving employee enters the information into the system. Once entered in the automated system, the complaint is forwarded to the Internal Affairs Bureau Commanding Officer for preliminary review. If it is determined the allegation can be investigated at the Bureau/District level, the case will be forwarded to
the appropriate Commanding Officer. The Commanding Officer will assign the case to an appropriate supervisor in the Bureau/District and a preliminary investigation will be completed. If during the preliminary investigation, the investigator believes the allegation cannot be handled at the Bureau/District level, a request for investigation by the IAB will be completed and forwarded, through the complaint management system to the subject member’s Division Chief.

Safeguards built into the system include the following: no one can delete the complaint or commendation. Only one supervisor can work on the complaint at a time (following the chain of command). Supervisors can add information but cannot remove it. All information inserted into the system is saved, documenting the date and time submitted and by whom. Supervisors can search the system to determine if the officer has like complaints and or commendations.

The system records all of the information and produces statistical information. Police managers use the information to determine future training needs as well as to decide an appropriate level of discipline

**District and Bureau Discipline**

The most severe discipline reported in this section are Written Reprimands, which are the lowest level of formal discipline. The Internal Affairs Section investigates cases that may require discipline greater than a Written Reprimand. Cases that result in corrective measures (training verses discipline) are recorded in the Automated Complaint and Commendation System. A Police Department Supervisor or Manager investigates all District / Bureau Discipline cases. He/she obtains all of the necessary information and reports his/her findings to his/her supervisor. The employee’s chain of command reviews the investigation. If any supervisor in the chain of command determines that the employee violated a Department Directive(s) and decides the appropriate level of discipline is a Written Reprimand, he/she makes that recommendation to the Chief of Police. If the Chief concurs with the findings, a Written Reprimand is prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Chief. The Chief of Police may personally issue and serve the Written Reprimand on the employee or delegate this duty to a command officer within the employee’s chain of command. The Written Reprimand is part of the employee’s permanent discipline file.

**Formal Internal Investigations and Discipline**

All requests for formal Internal Affairs investigations must be approved by the Chief of Police or designee. As a general rule, the Chief orders formal investigations on allegations that could potentially result in discipline that is greater than a Written Reprimand. Additionally, critical incidents (i.e. police shootings, use of force resulting in serious injuries or death, serious traffic accidents involving officers, etc.) may result in a formal investigation regardless of whether there is any evidence or accusation of misconduct. The Chief’s order will allege a violation(s) of Department Directive(s). The Internal Affairs Section completes the investigation and reports its findings to the accused officer’s Division Chief. The officer’s Division Chief decides whether the evidence proves the alleged violation(s). If so, the Division Chief will sustain the allegation(s). When the Division Chief sustains an allegation, the Chief of Police orders discipline in accordance with the City’s and Department’s policies.
Perspective Statistics

The Department provides the following statistical information for the purpose of perspective. The Department currently employs 695 sworn officers and 142 civilian employees (total 837). During 2016, the Department handled 235,188 calls for service from the public, arrested 12,214 suspects, issued 6,601 criminal summonses (non-custodial arrests) and issued 22,794 traffic citations (this excludes parking tickets and General Offense related traffic summonses).

Formal Department Awards

During 2016, the Aurora Police Department presented 120 awards through the formal program. The Department did not present a Medal of Honor award. The Department honored 20 officers with the Distinguished Service Cross. The Department presented two Purple Heart Awards. The Department presented nine officers with the Life Saving Award. The Department recognized 19 officers with the Meritorious Service Ribbon. The Chief commended 41 officers and civilians with Chief’s Commendation Certificates. The Chief presented three Chief’s Unit Citations. The Department presented 15 citizens with the Certificate of Appreciation - Citizens Award. The Department presented four Community Commitment Certificates. The Department presented four Excellence Awards. The Department presented three Innovation Awards.
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**Medal of Honor**

The Medal of Honor may be awarded by the Chief of Police to members who distinguish themselves by intentionally and knowingly placing themselves in a situation that involves an actual and imminent danger of death and whose actions demonstrate conspicuous bravery or heroism significantly above and beyond the call of duty. The member must perform an act so outstanding that it clearly demonstrates extraordinary courage beyond the requirements of the Distinguished Service Cross. The member must have been aware of the great personal danger to himself/herself prior to the performance of the act and the act must have involved an imminent, actual and substantial threat to the member’s life. This award will be a medal, pin and a certificate presented by the Chief of Police.

The department did not present a Medal of Honor award in 2016.
**Distinguished Service Cross**

The Distinguished Service Cross may be awarded by the Chief of Police to members who distinguish themselves by demonstrating exceptional bravery despite an imminent risk of serious bodily injury or death. A member may be aware or unaware of great personal peril to himself/herself prior to the performance of the act. This award will be a medal, pin and a certificate presented by the Chief of Police.

The department presented 20 Distinguished Service Cross awards in 2016.

**Officer Dominic Marziano, Officer Michael Tilton, Officer Eric Waters**

On January 15, 2015 at about 2230 hours, masked gunmen robbed the Fast and Friendly convenience store located at 138 Del Mar Circle. Officer Matthew Milligan obtained a detailed description of the suspects and aired the information. Officer Eric Waters spotted a suspect with a mask getting into a nearby vehicle as a passenger. The vehicle sped away and headed east on 6th Avenue. The vehicle failed to pull over after Officer Dominic Marziano tried to stop it. A pursuit was authorized and proceeded east on 6th Avenue at speeds approaching 100 MPH. Lieutenant Lee Silver joined the pursuit as the second car and began calling it out. The suspects turned north on Tower Road off of 6th Avenue. This is a dirt road and a dead end with a parking area. Officer Marziano was joined by Officer Waters and Officer Michael Tilton. Officers pitted and pinned the vehicle. The driver remained in the car and ultimately surrendered without incident. The passenger climbed out a window with a handgun in his hand. The armed suspect continued to ignore Officers’ commands as they advanced on him, leaving them no choice but to fire their weapons. Later, the suspect was pronounced dead at an area hospital. Lieutenant Silver expertly coordinated the crime scene and briefed the Major Crimes Unit on what had happened. Officer Milligan did an excellent job in continuing the investigation and arresting the driver of the vehicle.

**Sergeant Dale Leonard**

On the evening of December 12, 2015, Shawna Allen, of the Aurora 911 Communications Center, answered a terrifying and frantic call from a mother reporting that both she and her adult daughter were being attacked by the daughter's boyfriend, who was armed with a knife. Dispatcher Brittany Jones communicated with dispatched officers. Officer Dale Leonard responded to 745 Kenton Street on the call of the stabbing. Officer Dale Leonard was one of the first officers to respond to the scene and he observed the suspect actively stabbing the daughter in the middle of the street with a large knife. The victim was fighting for her life as Officer Leonard approached to within several feet of the suspect, giving multiple orders that were ignored. Officer Leonard was forced to fire at the suspect striking him multiple times.
Officer Leonard and Officer Dan Clark removed the suspect from the victim, while Officer Declaire began performing life saving measures on the stabbing victim. Because of their efforts, the victim was able to arrive at the hospital alive, but unfortunately, she died from her wounds hours later. The seriously injured mother, who originally called 911, survived her wounds. The suspect was transported to a local hospital and pronounced deceased.

Lieutenant Stephen Redfearn
At approximately 1339 hours on May 9, 2016, it was reported to Aurora Police Dispatch that two suspects were shooting at each other in the intersection of E. 19th Ave and N. Akron St. Responding officers obtained descriptions of the shooters and a suspect vehicle that one of the suspects left in after the shooting. At approximately 1355 hours Lieutenant Steve Redfearn spotted a vehicle matching the description of the suspect vehicle near the intersection of E Colfax Ave and N Wabash St in Denver. Lt. Redfearn contacted nearby Denver Police Officers and they attempted to make contact with the subjects in the vehicle, which had parked next to a motel. As the vehicle stopped, a subject matching the description of one of the shooters, exited the vehicle holding a gun in his right hand and started running away. Lt. Redfearn initiated a foot pursuit of the armed suspect. Lt. Redfearn lost sight of the suspect as the suspect ducked into the closed courtyard of the motel. Lt. Redfearn set up near where he had last seen the suspect. A few seconds later the suspect appeared at a full run towards Lt. Redfearn, still with a pistol in his right hand. Lt. Redfearn assessed the suspect as a threat to him and other officers in the area so he fired a single shot striking the suspect and causing him to drop the pistol. The suspect continued to flee and Lt. Redfearn ran after him. The suspect was taken into custody by APD and DPD officers. After the suspect was in custody, Lt. Redfearn went back to the suspect vehicle and assisted in taking two subjects still there into custody. Once all subjects were in custody, Lt. Redfearn remained calm while he directed officers to secure the scene, render aid to the wounded suspect and keep a hostile crowd at bay.

Sergeant Matthew Brukbacher, Officer David Sanderson and K9 Draco, Officer Brian Ross, Officer James Benedict, Officer Alex Eisaman
On November 5, 2016 at about 8:30pm, Sergeant Matthew Brukbacher, Sergeant Jay Van Kam, Officer Larry Bankston, Officer Blake Beasley, Officer Scott Benedict, Officer James Declaire, Officer Brian Ross, Officer David Sanderson with K-9 Draco, and Recruit Officer Alex Eisaman responded to a possible hostage situation at 5388 South Harvest Way. The officers observed a suspect holding his father hostage at gun point with a shotgun inside the living room of the house. Officers requested additional resources and a crisis entry team was formed. As notifications were being made, the suspect racked the shotgun while still holding his father at gun point. Based on this act and grave concern for the hostage, the crisis team entered the rear of the home through an open sliding door. This team was led by Sergeant Brukbacher and consisted of Officer Sanderson with Draco, Officer Ross, Officer Benedict, and Officer Eisaman. The suspect put the shotgun onto the couch just prior to officer contact. The suspect was safely taken into custody and the victim rescued with only minor injuries. The suspect was held on 2nd Degree Kidnap, 3rd Degree Assault on an At Risk Adult and Felony Menacing.

Sergeant Darren Chamberland, Sergeant Brandon Samuels, Officer Robert Fowler
On November 20, 2016, Sergeant Darren Chamberland requested extra officers to respond to Club Galaxy, 2025 Clinton Street, in anticipation of problems when the bar closed. The club was filled to capacity and the security officers had informed Sergeant Chamberland that they were expecting problems at the end
of the night. Sergeant Brandon Samuels and Officer Robert Fowler responded to the location to assist. At about 0155 hours, hundreds of people exited the club and were in the parking lot. Sergeant Samuels heard a verbal altercation occurring between several males, followed by three gunshots. Sergeant Samuels, Sergeant Chamberland, and Officer Fowler immediately ran towards the shooter. As they approached, Sergeant Samuels observed the suspect fire more gunshots. The male that the suspect was shooting at tackled the suspect to the ground. Hundreds of people were running from the area, creating a very chaotic situation. The officers approached the two men, who were on the ground fighting over the gun. Concerned for the safety of the people around them, the officers closed the distance and prepared to shoot the suspect at close range to end the situation. Officer Fowler saw an opportunity and fired his Taser at the suspect. This allowed Sergeant Samuels and Sergeant Chamberland to grab the two males on the ground. Sergeant Chamberland was able to grab the gun (a .45 caliber pistol) away from the suspect. The two Sergeants placed the suspect into custody.

Officer Edward Clements, Sergeant Jacob Stull, Officer Jeremiah Miles
On the snowy evening of November 30, 2015, Officer Edward Clements stopped to contact the occupant of an apparently disabled vehicle stopped on the northbound on-ramp of I-225 at East Alameda Avenue. During that contact, Officer Clements was violently attacked by a male who hit him in the head with a meat cleaver. Officer Clements received a laceration on his head that was approximately 4 inches in length and cut down to the bone of his skull. This injury caused massive bleeding and a severe risk of permanent disfigurement or death.

The suspect stole Officer Clements’ police vehicle and intentionally tried to strike him with it. Officer Clements was able to gather his composure after the violent attack and radio all of this information to other officers. Officer Steven Garcia was the first officer to arrive after the attack and found Officer Clements next to the disabled car, near a suspect who remained on scene. Officer Garcia physically moved Officer Clements to better cover, then maintained control of the second suspect. Officer Darren Martinez responded to help Officer Clements and provided first aid and calmed him while waiting for an ambulance.

In the area of East Alameda Parkway and South Buckley Road, Sergeant Jacob Stull located the stolen police vehicle. Officer Jeremiah Miles was close behind the Sergeant. Sergeant Stull pursued the stolen car and made intentional vehicle to vehicle contact in the area of East Alameda Parkway and East Kentucky Avenue, successfully ending the suspect’s attempt to flee. Sergeant Stull and Officer Miles confronted the suspect, who was holding an unidentifiable black object in his hands. This suspect ignored arrest commands and refused to drop the unknown object after exiting the stolen police vehicle. Fearing his escape and further violent assaults on themselves or others, Sergeant Stull and Officer Miles fired, stopping the suspect and preventing his escape into the Aurora community.

Officer Erick Ortiz, Sergeant Cassidee Carlson, Officer Stephen Edwards, Officer Jeremy W. Jenkins
On November 8, 2016, at about 11:20 AM, a suspect, Juan Ramos, drove to the area of 6th Avenue and Peoria Street and shot his ex-girlfriend’s new boyfriend. Witnesses on scene were able to identify the suspect’s car. Members of the Department’s Fugitive Apprehension and Surveillance Team (FAST) and the Strategic Response Team (SRT) located the suspect’s house in Denver and set up on it while waiting for Denver Metro SWAT to arrive. Undercover Denver Police Department units also arrived to maintain surveillance on the house. An SRT element comprised of Sergeant Cassidee Carlson, Officer Erick Ortiz, Officer Stephen Edwards and Officer Jeremy W. Jenkins, sat in an unmarked truck down the street and
formulated a plan for an immediate assault of the suspect’s vehicle if he should try to leave, coordinating with FAST Officers James Giordano and Emily Hitchings.

At about 11:50 AM, the suspect exited his house carrying an infant car seat and headed toward his car. Officer Ortiz started driving the SRT truck toward the suspect’s house. Officer Edwards was in the front passenger seat, Sergeant Carlson was behind him and Officer Jenkins was seated behind Officer Ortiz. The suspect put the infant seat into his car. As the truck slowly approached the house and was about 100 feet away, the suspect identified that it was a police vehicle and armed himself. The suspect opened fire on the SRT truck, striking the front passenger door and the windshield. One round passed through the windshield and struck Officer Ortiz on the right side of his face. Sergeant Carlson and Officer Edwards engaged the suspect with gun fire and eliminated the threat. Officer Ortiz stopped the vehicle about ten feet from the suspect’s vehicle and calmly exited the truck, letting everyone know he had been shot. Officer Jenkins and Sergeant Carlson took tactical positions on the house and suspect car.

Officer Paul Timmons, Officer Giordano, Officer Hitchings, and Denver Police Sergeant Bryce Jackson went to the aide of Officer Ortiz. They loaded Officer Ortiz into Sergeant Jackson’s police car. Officer Timmons got in the back with Officer Ortiz to hold pressure on the wound while Officer Giordano held Officer Ortiz’s hand and called out the car’s location to coordinate road closures. They drove to the hospital escorted by Officer Hitchings.
The Purple Heart may be awarded by the Chief of Police to any member who sustains a gunshot wound, stab wound, or serious injury, under aggravated and hostile circumstances, which could have resulted in death or could potentially result in a permanent disability, which may force the member to retire. This award will be a medal, pin, and a certificate presented by the Chief of Police.

The department presented two Purple Heart awards in 2016.

Officer Edward Clements
On the snowy evening of November 30, 2015, Officer Edward Clements stopped to contact the occupant of an apparently disabled vehicle which was stopped on the northbound on-ramp of I-225 at East Alameda Avenue. During that contact, Officer Clements was violently attacked by a person who hit him in the head with a meat cleaver. Officer Clements received a laceration on his head that was approximately 4 inches in length and cut down to the bone of his skull. This injury caused massive bleeding and a severe risk of permanent disfigurement or death.

The suspect stole Officer Clements’ police vehicle and intentionally tried to strike him with it. Officer Clements was able to gather his composure after the violent attack and radio all of this information to other officers. Officer Steven Garcia was the first officer to arrive after the attack and found Officer Clements next to the disabled car, near a suspect who remained on scene. Officer Garcia physically moved Officer Clements to better cover, then maintained control of the second suspect. Officer Darren Martinez responded to help Officer Clements and provided first aid and calmed him while waiting for an ambulance.

In the area of East Alameda Parkway and South Buckley Road, Sergeant Jacob Stull located the stolen police vehicle. Officer Jeremiah Miles was close behind the Sergeant. Sergeant Stull pursued the stolen car and made intentional vehicle to vehicle contact in the area of East Alameda Parkway and East Kentucky Avenue, successfully ending the suspect’s attempt to flee. Sergeant Stull and Officer Miles confronted the suspect, who was holding an unidentifiable black object in his hands. This suspect ignored arrest commands and refused to drop the unknown object after exiting the stolen police vehicle. Fearing his escape and further violent assaults on themselves or others, Sergeant Stull and Officer Miles fired, stopping the suspect and preventing his escape into the Aurora community.
Officer Erick Ortiz

On November 8, 2016, at about 11:20 AM, a suspect, Juan Ramos, drove to the area of 6th Avenue and Peoria Street and shot his ex-girlfriend’s new boyfriend. Witnesses on scene were able to identify the getaway car. Members of the Department’s Fugitive Apprehension and Surveillance Team (FAST) and the Strategic Response Team (SRT) located the suspect’s house in Denver and set up on it while waiting for Denver Metro SWAT to arrive. Undercover Denver Police Department units also arrived to maintain surveillance on the house. An SRT element comprised of Sergeant Cassidee Carlson, Officer Erick Ortiz, Officer Stephen Edwards and Officer Jeremy W. Jenkins, sat in an unmarked truck down the street and formulated a plan for an immediate assault of the suspect’s vehicle if he should try to leave, coordinating with FAST Officers James Giordano and Emily Hitchings.

At about 11:50 AM, the suspect exited his house carrying an infant car seat and headed toward his car. Officer Ortiz started driving the SRT truck toward the suspect’s house. Officer Edwards was in the front passenger seat, Sergeant Carlson was behind him and Officer Jenkins was seated behind Officer Ortiz. The suspect put the infant seat into his car. As the truck slowly approached the house and was about 100 feet away, the suspect identified that it was a police vehicle and armed himself. The suspect opened fire on the SRT truck, striking the front passenger door and the windshield. One round passed through the windshield and struck Officer Ortiz on the right side of his face. Sergeant Carlson and Officer Edwards engaged the suspect with gunfire and eliminated the threat. Officer Ortiz stopped the vehicle about ten feet from the suspect’s vehicle and calmly exited the truck, letting everyone know he had been shot. Officer Jenkins and Sergeant Carlson took tactical positions on the house and suspect car.

Officer Paul Timmons, Officer Giordano, Officer Hitchings, and Denver Police Sergeant Bryce Jackson went to the aide of Officer Ortiz. They loaded Officer Ortiz into Sergeant Jackson’s police car. Officer Timmons got in the back with Officer Ortiz to hold pressure on the wound while Officer Giordano held Officer Ortiz’s hand and called out the car’s location to coordinate road closures. They drove to the hospital escorted by Officer Hitchings.
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**Life Saving Award**

The Life Saving Award may be awarded by the Chief of Police to members who personally save a life. The lifesaving effort will normally involve one of the learned life supporting processes: mouth-to-mouth resuscitation, cardio-pulmonary resuscitation, the Heimlich maneuver for choking victims, or the control of severe bleeding. To merit this award, the member’s actions must be significant. Additionally, the award is only bestowed to the member if the victim survives the incident. The request for a life-saving award will be accompanied by a document from witnesses or an attending physician stating the methods applied contributed significantly to the victim’s survival. This award will only apply when victims are at imminent risk of death. This will normally not include deliberate actions taken by the victim or victims, unless the victim or victims have inflicted injury upon themselves that is actually life threatening. This award will be a pin and certificate presented by the Chief of Police.

The department presented nine Life Saving awards in 2016.

**Officer Joseph Cornell and Officer Grant Peet**

On October 22, 2016, patrol was dispatched to In Town Suites, 2221 South Havana Street on the report of a stabbing. The reporting party indicated that he had stabbed another individual after being assaulted multiple times, and that the other individual had fled the scene in a sedan.

A short time after the initial contact Public Safety Communications received a Fire Assist call for service to 1001 South Havana Street Unit 120 for a male who had suffered a stab wound to the torso. APD patrol units responded with Denver Police and Denver Fire and confirmed this was the second subject involved in the original altercation and that the subject’s vehicle was present on scene. Officer Grant Peet and Officer Joseph Cornell were the first officers into the apartment. Officer Peet applied direct pressure to the wound, while Officer Cornell obtained a plastic bag and used it to cover the hole that was creating a tension pneumothorax. Upon arrival of Denver Health paramedics, they took one look at the wound and advised the officers to keep pressure on it while they immediately loaded the patient into the ambulance and transported him emergent to Denver Health, where he immediately underwent emergency life-saving surgery for a collapsed lung.

**Officer Thomas Starz and Officer Jason Weber**

On December 29\textsuperscript{th}, 2016, at 1329 hours Officers Thomas Starz and Jason Weber were dispatched to the 14500 Block of East Ford Place on a call of shots fired. Dispatch advised that it was a drive-by shooting; the suspect had left in a white vehicle and the victim, Jalen Johnson, had a gunshot wound to the leg. When officers arrived they could see Mr. Johnson laying on the ground by the passenger side of a vehicle and several people surrounding him. As they got closer to Mr. Johnson they could see that he was bleeding and a tourniquet was on his leg, which was placed there by another citizen. Officer Starz placed a new tourniquet higher up on Mr. Johnson’s leg to help stop the bleeding. Mr. Johnson was alert and talking and stated that he had also been shot in the stomach. Officer Weber was able to move Mr. Johnson’s arm out of the way and lift his shirt when he observed a gunshot wound. Officer Starz was able to pack the
abdomen with gauze and held pressure until Aurora Fire Rescue arrived. Mr. Johnson was transported to Aurora South Medical Center where he went into surgery. After surgery and a few hours in ICU, Mr. Johnson was able to move to a room where he fully recovered.

The lifesaving actions of these Aurora Police Department officers shows a tremendous example of commitment to community, selfless service and teamwork, providing this man with another opportunity at life.

**Officer Joseph Duran and Officer Bridget Johnson**

On January 27, 2017, at approximately 0041 hours Officer Bridget Johnson was on routine patrol traveling eastbound on E. Alameda Ave. approaching S. Joplin St. when she observed a vehicle with its lights on which had apparently gone off the north side of the roadway and was at the bottom of an embankment. Officer Johnson went down the embankment and approached the vehicle and saw the driver whose eyes were open, but he was not blinking and he was unresponsive. Officer Johnson advised she could hear abnormal breathing upon initially contacting the man. Officer Joseph Duran also went down the embankment with Officer Johnson and observed the driver take a shallow breath, then did not take any subsequent breaths. Officer Johnson and Officer Duran then grabbed the driver and removed him from the vehicle. As they were removing the man from the vehicle he remained unresponsive. They placed him on the ground and it appeared he was not breathing at all. Officer Johnson then began chest compressions on the man and he remained unresponsive during the chest compressions for a period of approximately 15 to 20 seconds. Officer Duran saw the man blinking his eyes and mumbling. Officer Johnson and Officer Duran rolled the driver onto his side in the recovery position to attempt to help him breathe. Officer Duran began to slowly speak to the man as he regained consciousness. Rescue then arrived on scene and transported him to the Medical Center of Aurora where he had a full recovery.

**Sergeant Jason Pray**

On February 19, 2017, at approximately 11:32 hours, Sergeant Jason Pray responded to a COR-0 fire assist call at 3293 S. Truckee Way #101. Call notes stated, a 28 year old male was unconscious and not breathing. Sergeant Pray arrived on scene, assessed the patient at which time he found no pulse and learned that the male had a history of drug use. Sgt. Pray started CPR and continued approximately 69 compressions before getting a faint pulse on the male. AFD Station 10, C-Shift arrived and administered “Narcan.” The patient was transported to The Medical Center of Aurora and treated by E.R. DR. Vangeti. The E.R. notes for the patient stated the patient was given Narcan "Post-Code." Dr. Vangeti advised Sergeant Pray's action was indeed "heroic" and contributed to saving the patient’s life until Narcan could be administered.

On February 19, 2017, at approximately 14:13 hours, Sergeant Jason Pray responded to a welfare check at 17240 E. Baltic Place. He arrived on scene and encountered a 56 year old female who tightly secured a thick industrial strength zip tie around her neck, cutting off her airway. Sergeant Pray reacted quickly and attempted to cut the zip tie free with scissors but was unsuccessful. AFD arrived and were requested to expedite their approach. Sergeant Pray wedged his finger underneath the zip tie to create the slightest bit of room, obtained a heavy duty pair of cutters and freed the zip tie from the woman’s throat just as she went unconscious. Sergeant Pray and Officer Garcia were able to break her fall, preventing a head injury. Upon being softly lowered to the floor, the woman began to breath on her own and regained consciousness.
Officer Brandon Cameron and Officer William Miller
On March 12, 2017, at approximately 1606 hours Officers Brandon Cameron and William Miller responded to AMF Bowling Alley at 16700 E. Mississippi Ave. This was in reference to a medical assist call, where a 60 year-old male was passed out at the location. The male was unconscious and breathing very slowly. Upon arrival Officer Brandon Cameron and Officer William Miller noticed the male on the floor underneath the chairs. The male was later identified as Troy Hopkins. Mr. Hopkins was unresponsive, not breathing and his skin color was turning blue. Officer Cameron and Officer Miller moved Mr. Hopkins from under the chairs and immediately began chest compressions. Both officers continued chest compressions until Aurora Fire and Rescue arrived on scene. Mr. Hopkins was transported to Aurora South Medical Center. Mr. Hopkins was found to be in ventricular fibrillation. Due to the actions of the officers Mr. Hopkins has made a full recovery. The lifesaving actions of these officers shows a tremendous example of commitment to community, selfless service and teamwork.
The Meritorious Service Ribbon may be awarded by the Chief of Police for service rendered in the line of duty when a member, because of diligence and perseverance, performs difficult tasks under unusual circumstances and goes far beyond that which is normally expected of members. This award will be a pin and certificate presented by the Chief of Police.

The department presented 19 Meritorious Services Ribbons in 2016.

Agent Keith Booton, Agent Steven Crowe, Agent Del Matticks, Agent Susan Wynn

In January of 2016, a sex assault at gun point was reported in District 2. Based on a review of the report, Sergeant Herrera and Agent Matticks believed that this case might be the work of a serial rapist. Agents Wynn, Booton and Crowe were assigned to assist Agent Matticks in the investigation. Their collective work lead to the development of hard evidence including a DNA profile of the suspect. While conducting the investigation into the Aurora Case, Agent Matticks contacted surrounding jurisdictions to see if they had a similar crime pattern. He found that the Colorado Springs Police Department had two similar cases. Colorado Springs analyzed the evidence in their case and were able to identify a suspect based on fingerprints found at a crime scene. This suspect, in the military at the time and stationed in Colorado Springs, had applied for a concealed weapons permit. Once arrested, the suspect was quickly tied to the Aurora case. A search of the suspect’s cell phone revealed that he kept videos of his assaults, and many victims still have yet to be identified. The suspect was arrested in February of 2016, preventing further brutal assaults.

Officer Cory Budaj, Officer Keith Burke, Officer Paul Seiwald

On July 20, 2016, at 0922 hours, officers responded to the area of E. 2nd Pl. and N. Jamestown Way on the report of a male with a weapon. The reporting party stated a suspect had pointed a rifle at him while the victim sat on his porch. The male continued to wave the rifle around and was headed toward the direction of Vista Peak High School where football practice was being conducted. Officer Paul Seiwald came in to the area from the south and observed the suspect waiving the rifle around. Officer Seiwald had Officer Keith Burke and Officer Cory Budaj come in from the north. Officers Budaj Burke deployed their rifles. The suspect pointed his rifle in the direction of Officer Budaj and Officer Burke multiple times. Officer Budaj, a trained marksman using a scoped rifle, was able to determine that the suspect was holding his rifle by the muzzle. Officer Alscher went to the school to warn the football players of the situation, then took a position to the west of the suspect. As officers were giving the suspect orders, he put down the rifle but then would pick it up again. Officer Seiwald again ordered the male to the ground at which time Officer Burke and Officer Alscher took him into custody. Due to the communication on scene and the restraint and perseverance of the officers the incident was able to be brought to a close with no injuries and tragedy was avoided.
Sergeant David Wells, Officer William Hummel, Officer Christopher Johnson, Officer Bryan Knox, Officer Brian O’Halloran, Officer David Pearson, Officer Max Schoolmaster

On September 11th, 2016, James Draper, a suspect in a homicide, carjacked a vehicle in the 1400 block of Beeler St. Draper was later determined to be armed with a MAC 45 and a handgun. After the carjacking, Draper fired the weapons at people in the city. Officer Brian O’Halloran located the vehicle on Havana St. towards 6th Ave. and engaged in a pursuit. Officer William Hummel assisted in the pursuit and both officers were threatened by Draper with the MAC 45. The pursuit eventually ended at East Colfax Avenue and Yosemite Street after Denver Officer Jeffrey Jenkins intentionally rammed the vehicle. On scene, Sgt. Wells approached the vehicle and was able to grab the MAC 45 out of the vehicle. In the tense aftermath of the collision, Officers Brian Knox, Dave Pearson, Brian O’Halloran, William Hummel, Dave Johnson, Max Schoolmaster and Denver Officer Simeon Codo took Draper into custody after he refused to obey verbal orders. These officers are commended for their professionalism in pursuing and arresting this violent criminal with no one injured.

Officer Steven Garcia, Officer Darren Martinez

On the snowy evening of November 30th, 2015, Officer Edward Clements stopped to contact the occupant of an apparently disabled vehicle which was stopped on the northbound on-ramp of I-225 at East Alameda Avenue. During that contact, Officer Clements was violently attacked by a person who hit him in the head with a meat cleaver. Officer Clements received a laceration on his head that was approximately 4 inches in length and cut down to the bone of his skull. This injury caused massive bleeding and a severe risk of permanent disfigurement or death.

The suspect stole Officer Clements’ police vehicle and intentionally tried to strike him with it. Officer Clements was able to gather his composure after the violent attack and radio all of this information to other officers. Officer Steven Garcia was the first officer to arrive after the attack and found Officer Clements next to the disabled car, near a suspect who remained on scene. Officer Garcia physically moved Officer Clements to better cover, then maintained control of the second suspect. Officer Darren Martinez responded to help Officer Clements and provided first aid and calmed him while waiting for an ambulance.

In the area of East Alameda Parkway and South Buckley Road, Sergeant Jacob Stull located the stolen police vehicle. Officer Jeremiah Miles was close behind the Sergeant. Sergeant Stull pursued the stolen car and made intentional vehicle to vehicle contact in the area of East Alameda Parkway and East Kentucky Avenue, successfully ending the suspect’s attempt to flee. Sergeant Stull and Officer Miles confronted the suspect, who was holding an unidentifiable black object in his hands. This suspect ignores arrest commands and refused to drop the unknown object after exiting the stolen police vehicle. Fearing his escape and further violent assaults on themselves or others, Sergeant Stull and Officer Miles fired, stopping the suspect and preventing his escape into the Aurora community.

Officer James Giordano, Officer Paul Timmons, Officer Emily Hitchings

On November 8, 2016, at about 11:20 AM, a suspect, Juan Ramos, drove to the area of 6th Avenue and Peoria Street and shot his ex-girlfriend’s new boyfriend. Witnesses on scene were able to identify the getaway car. Members of the Department’s Fugitive Apprehension and Surveillance Team (FAST) and the Strategic Response Team (SRT) located the suspect’s house in Denver and set up on it while waiting for Denver Metro SWAT to arrive. Undercover Denver Police Department units also arrived to maintain surveillance on the house. An SRT element comprised of Sergeant Cassidee Carlson, Officer Erick Ortiz,
Officer Stephen Edwards and Officer Jeremy W. Jenkins, sat in an unmarked truck down the street and formulated a plan for an immediate assault of the suspect’s vehicle if he should try to leave, coordinating with FAST Officers James Giordano and Emily Hitchings.

At about 11:50 AM, the suspect exited his house carrying an infant car seat and headed toward his car. Officer Ortiz started driving the SRT truck toward the suspect’s house. Officer Edwards was in the front passenger seat, Sergeant Carlson was behind him and Officer Jenkins was seated behind Officer Ortiz. The suspect put the infant seat into his car. As the truck slowly approached the house and was about 100 feet away, the suspect identified that it was a police vehicle and armed himself. The suspect opened fire on the SRT truck, striking the front passenger door and the windshield. One round passed through the windshield and struck Officer Ortiz on the right side of his face. Sergeant Carlson and Officer Edwards engaged the suspect with gun fire and eliminated the threat. Officer Ortiz stopped the vehicle about ten feet from the suspect’s vehicle and calmly exited the truck, letting everyone know he had been shot. Officer Jenkins and Sergeant Carlson took tactical positions on the house and suspect car.

Officer Paul Timmons, Officer Giordano, Officer Hitchings, and Denver Police Sergeant Bryce Jackson went to the aide of Officer Ortiz. They loaded Officer Ortiz into Sergeant Jackson’s police car. Officer Timmons got in the back with Officer Ortiz to hold pressure on the wound while Officer Giordano held Officer Ortiz’s hand and called out the car’s location to coordinate road closures. They drove to the hospital escorted by Officer Hitchings.
Chief’s Commendation Certificate

The Chief’s Commendation Certificate may be awarded by the Chief of Police to a member for exceptional contribution to the progress of the Department, or to individuals who perform their duties in an unusually effective manner. The contribution must be adopted by the Department and increase the administrative or operational efficiency of the Department. The Chief of Police may recognize individual members of other law enforcement organizations, or multi-jurisdictional task forces, for this award.

The department presented 41 Chief’s Commendation Certificates in 2016.

Lieutenant Michael McClelland

Lieutenant Michael McClelland served on the Aurora Police Department’s Awards Board from 2009 through 2016 and has been the chair of the board since 2012. Lieutenant McClelland coordinated the awards nomination process from receipt to board approval and finally approval from the Chief’s Office. He coordinated the annual awards ceremony, obtaining materials, vendor contracts and the venue for the event. In 2013, he coordinated with the special Century 16 Sub-Committee of the awards board on a dedicated awards ceremony for the response to the events of July 20, 2012. In addition to his normal duties, Lieutenant McClelland maintained records on award nominations and awards presented, and kept stock of medals and pins. Lieutenant McClelland also updated the Awards for Members Directives during his tenure.

Officer Ryan Marker

On May 25, 2016, Officer Ryan Marker attended the Mothers Against Drunk Driving (M.A.D.D.) Award Ceremony. Officer Marker was bestowed with the Colonel Mark V. Trostel Law Enforcement Officer of the Year Award. This is the highest award that M.A.D.D. gives out at its annual awards ceremony. Officer Marker rightfully earned this award for making 594 DUI arrests in 2015, and for his continued dedication to educate the public on the dangers of drunk driving. Annually, Officer Marker makes more DUI arrests than any officer in the State of Colorado. In the eight years Officer Marker has been with the Aurora Police Department he has made 2,747 DUI arrests.

Agent Alan Shank, Officer Anthony Camacho, Officer Jared Lobato, Officer Jeffrey Robertson, Property Supervisor Rebecca Luna, Richard Nylen (IT), Deann Robertson (IT)

Over the past two years the Property and Evidence Unit reviewed and tested property report Direct Entry into the Department’s Records Management System with the goal of eliminating paper reports. After several months of testing and evaluating the Direct Entry process it was determined that by implementing Direct Entry, efficiencies would be gained and it would bring the department into compliance with nationwide best businesses practices for property and evidence.

After the decision was made to go to Direct Entry the problem of how to get department users trained was tackled by a very impressive team of officers. Officers Jeff Robertson, Jared Lobato, Tony Camacho, Agent Alan Shank, Property Supervisor Rebecca Luna and Richard Nylen from the city’s IT Department all took on the task of training the members of APD. Several times they had to come in on their days and time off so the least number of officers would be inconvenienced while maximizing the number of officers trained, doing all of this in addition to their regularly assigned tasks.
The team demonstrated extensive knowledge in the process they were teaching while taking the initiative to significantly improve the administrative practices of the Property and Evidence Unit.

It is important to recognize Deann Robertson, of the city IT Department, who has been instrumental in researching and recognizing many of the outdated processes as well as correcting the discrepancies.

Deann has spent several hours programming and testing new reports and processes to bring the system up to date and to bring the Property and Evidence Unit current with the best business practices. Deann has demonstrated ownership in this process while providing two-way communication between the Command Staff, Property and Evidence Technicians and the officers of the department. Deann went above and beyond when she helped train members of the department on the Direct Entry of property and evidence. Deann solicited volunteers to help in this endeavor when she was not able to do it herself and to ensure that the final product had been fully vetted.

Officer Scott Brandon, Officer Javen Harper

On March 22nd, 2017, APD dispatch was notified of a hit and run crash involving two semi-trucks on I-70 at C-470. This is the jurisdiction of the Colorado State Patrol. Dispatch advised that a witness told them that the suspect vehicle was a white and red semi-truck with no additional information. Responding officers found that the driver of a semi that was stopped on the right shoulder had been out of the vehicle, had been struck and was seriously injured. That driver was transported to the hospital.

Officer Brandon saw the information for the witness in the CAD call notes and he called him. The witness said that he had given all of the information to the call taker as he followed the suspect truck to include the company name and numbers on the truck and trailer. These details were not in the call notes. Officer Brandon then called dispatch and asked them to listen to the call recording and get those details.

Once they got those details, Officers Brandon and Harper used the internet to find information for the leasing company for the truck, then the information for their dispatch and made contact with them. They learned that the truck was equipped with GPS and found that the truck was in the area of I-70 and Havana. A few more phone calls led to contact with the driver who gave Officer Brandon his location.

Officers Brandon and Harper contacted the truck driver. Their interview led to the driver admitting to crashing into the parked truck, though he did not know that he struck the other driver. CSP arrived and arrested the suspect driver for Felony Hit and Run.

As a result of the dogged investigation by these officers, a driver that caused life-threatening injuries to someone else was found and will be held accountable.

Sergeant Graham Dunne, Sergeant Dave Wells, Officer Christopher Johnson

On January 16th, 2017, Sergeant Dunne and Officer Chris Johnson located a vehicle taken during a carjacking with a gun which occurred on January 15, 2017. The two officers attempted to contact the driver and passenger but the vehicle fled, leading the officers on a pursuit. Sergeant Dave Wells joined in the pursuit as an additional vehicle. During the incident, the officers attempted to terminate the pursuit several times by intentionally contacting the suspect vehicle. Each time the suspect was able to escape and continue fleeing. Officer Johnson changed radio channels and begin communicating with Denver while continuing in the pursuit. The officers successfully terminated the pursuit on WB I-70 at about Holly
by intentionally contacting the suspect vehicle. The suspect driver refused to exit the car and the door was locked. Additionally, he was still attempting to flee as he was revving the engine in an attempt to run from the stop. The officers approached the stolen truck and with guns drawn and began giving loud verbal orders. Sergeant Dunne, recognizing a potential crossfire, directed officers to safer locations. Officer Johnson broke the door window. The suspect initially had his hands up and when Sergeant Wells went hands-on, but dove his hands toward the center console which prompted Sergeant Wells to strike the suspect fearing Archuleta was reaching for the gun used in the carjacking. Archuleta was pulled through the window by Sergeant Wells and Officer Johnson. As he was being removed, he continued to struggle. Sergeant Dunne deployed pepper spray into the face of Archuleta also exposing Sergeant Wells and Officer Johnson. Without disengaging due to the pepper-spray, Officer Johnson and Sergeant Wells took Archuleta into custody while Sergeant Dunne held the passenger at gun point. It was discovered that Mr. Archuleta had two existing warrants for escape. The three officers, with indifference to their own safety engaged in a dangerous event. Their actions removed a dangerous criminal from the public.

**Lieutenant Charles Deshazer, Sergeant Graham Dunne, Officer Chad Berger, Officer Michael Foley, Officer Christopher Johnson, Officer David Johnson, Officer Bryan Knox, Officer Clark Orchard**

On October 17, 2016, at about 1303 hours, officers were advised of a robbery alarm from the Key Bank at 10502 East Arizona Place. Shortly after, a witness from the bank called dispatch to advise they had just been robbed. With the assistance of the Safe Streets Task Force, information was obtained that the suspect was in the area of the 700 block of South Alton Way near some detached garages. Officer Bryan Knox observed a white Ford van parked near some dumpsters on the north end of the detached garages. Officer Knox observed a black male leaving the dumpster area and enter the van. The van then drove south through the detached garages toward South Alton Way. Lieutenant Chuck Deshazer observed the white van enter the roadway and began to travel eastbound. He placed his marked patrol unit directly in the path of the van and began closing distance with the intent to pin the front of the van. It was clear the van was occupied only by the driver. At the last possible moment the driver quickly maneuvered the van around Lieutenant Deshazer’s vehicle and was immediately pitted by Sergeant Graham Dunne. Officer David Johnson pinned the van from the rear while Officer Chris Johnson pinned the van from the front. Officer Foley and Lieutenant Deshazer, were now on foot with weapons drawn and ordered the driver out of the van. He was observed to be holding a white paper sack that he dropped out of the window and onto the ground. He then complied with orders, exited the van and was taken into custody without incident. He was later positively identified by the teller as the subject that had robbed her.

Officer Brian Dingwall responded to the bank and talked with the victim of the robbery. He was advised that the suspect had simulated a weapon during the robbery. After the suspect was taken into custody, Officer Clark Orchard and Officer Chad Berger responded to the dumpster the suspect was observed by and began to look in the bin for evidence. They located key evidence including currency assumed to be from the robbery. The quick actions of the officers involved resulted in a quick arrest of a dangerous suspect.

**Officer Chad Elliot, Officer Adam Roberts**

On November 15th, 2016, at about 2257 hours, District 3 Officers were dispatched to the Kohl’s located at 18307 E Hampden Ave. in regards to a shoplift complaint. While en-route to this call, the female suspect ran from store security and climbed a set of stairs at a nearby apartment complex. When she reached the
top of the stairs she brandished a knife and threatened to kill herself and possibly assault officers if she was touched.

Officers Chad Elliott and Adam Roberts responded to the scene. Officer Roberts deployed his assigned 40mm less lethal launcher. Multiple officers attempted to talk the female into surrendering, but she refused. At one point the female abruptly stood up and brandished the knife in the direction of officers. Officer Roberts fired a foam baton round from his 40mm launcher striking the female in the pelvis. She fell backwards but maintained control of the knife. As Officer Roberts and cover officers were ascending the stairs towards the female, Officer Roberts was able to reload the 40mm launcher and strike the subject with an additional round. This caused her to drop the knife and retreat behind a wall. Once officers reached the top of the stairs, the female had once again armed herself. Officer Elliott deployed his Taser and cover officers were able to subdue the female.

Due to the actions of Officers Elliott and Roberts, the female was taken into custody without the use of deadly force and without injuring herself. Officers Elliott and Roberts’ quick action potentially saved the life of the subject and other officers nearby.

Lieutenant Dana Hatfield, Acting Sergeant Todd Alscher
On July 20th, 2016, at 0922 hours, officers responded to the area of E. 2nd Pl. and N. Jamestown Way on the report of a male with a weapon. The reporting party stated a suspect had pointed a rifle at him while the victim sat on his porch. The male continued to wave the rifle around and was headed toward the direction of Vista Peak High School where football practice was being conducted. Officer Paul Seiwald came in to the area from the south and observed the suspect waiving the rifle around. Officer Seiwald had Officer Keith Burke and Officer Cory Budaj come in from the north. Officers Budaj Burke deployed their rifles. The suspect pointed his rifle in the direction of Officer Budaj and Officer Burke multiple times. Officer Budaj, a trained marksman using a scoped rifle, was able to determine that the suspect was holding his rifle by the muzzle. Officer Alscher went to the school to warn the football players of the situation, then took a position to the west of the suspect. As officers were giving the suspect orders he put down the rifle but then would pick it up again. Officer Seiwald again ordered the male to the ground at which time Officer Burke and Officer Alscher took him into custody.

Due to the communication on scene and the restraint and perseverance of the officers the incident was able to be brought to a close with no injuries and tragedy was avoided.

Officer Simeon Codo (Denver Police Department), Officer Jeffrey Jenkins (Denver Police Department)
On September 11th, 2016, James Draper, the suspect in a homicide, carjacked a vehicle in the 1400 block of Beeler St. Draper was later determined to be armed with a MAC 45 and a handgun. After the carjacking, Draper fired the weapons at people in the city. Officer Brian O’Halloran located the vehicle on Havana St. towards 6th Ave. and engaged in a pursuit. Officer William Hummel assisted in the pursuit and both officers were threatened by Draper with the MAC 45. The pursuit eventually ended at East Colfax Avenue and Yosemite Street after Denver Officer Jeffrey Jenkins intentionally rammed the vehicle. On scene, Sgt. Wells approached the vehicle and was able to grab the MAC 45 out of the vehicle. In the tense aftermath of the collision, Officers Brian Knox, Dave Pearson, Brian O’Halloran, William Hummel, Dave Johnson, Max Schoolmaster and Denver Officer Simeon Codo took Draper into custody after he refused to obey verbal orders.
These officers are commended for their professionalism in pursuing and arresting this violent criminal with no one injured.

**Lieutenant Leland Silver, Officer Matthew Milligan**
On January 15th, 2015, at about 2230 hours, masked gunmen robbed the Fast and Friendly convenience store located at 138 Del Mar Circle. Officer Matthew Milligan obtained a detailed description of the suspects and aired the information. Officer Eric Waters spotted a suspect with a mask getting into a nearby vehicle as a passenger. The vehicle sped away and headed east on 6th Avenue. The vehicle failed to pull over after Officer Dominic Marziano tried to stop it. A pursuit was authorized and proceeded east on 6th Avenue at speeds approaching 100 MPH. Lieutenant Lee Silver joined the pursuit as the second car and began calling it out. The suspects turned north on Tower Road off of 6th Avenue. This is a dirt road and a dead end with a parking area. Officer Marziano was joined by Officer Waters and Officer Michael Tilton. Officers pitted and pinned the vehicle. The driver remained in the car and ultimately surrendered without incident. The passenger climbed out a window and had a handgun in his hand. The armed suspect continued to ignore Officers’ commands as they advanced on him, leaving them no choice but to fire their weapons. Later, the suspect was pronounced dead at an area hospital. Lieutenant Silver expertly coordinated the crime scene and briefed the Major Crimes Unit on what had happened. Officer Milligan did an excellent job in continuing the investigation and arresting the driver of the vehicle.

**Shawna Allen (Public Safety Communications), Brittany Jones (Public Safety Communications)**
On the evening of December 12th, 2015, Shawna Allen, of the Aurora 911 Communications Center, answered a terrifying and frantic call from a mother reporting that both she and her adult daughter were being attacked by the daughter's boyfriend, who was armed with a knife. Dispatcher Brittany Jones communicated with dispatched officers. Officer Dale Leonard responded to 745 Kenton Street on the call of the stabbing. Officer Dale Leonard was one of the first officers to respond to the scene and he observed the suspect actively stabbing the daughter in the middle of the street with a large knife. The victim was fighting for her life as Officer Leonard approached to within several feet of the suspect, giving multiple orders that were ignored. Officer Leonard was forced to fire at the suspect striking him multiple times. Officer Leonard and Officer Dan Clark removed the suspect from the victim, while Officer Declaire began performing life saving measures on the stabbing victim. Because of their efforts, the victim was able to arrive at the hospital alive, but unfortunately, died from her wounds a short time later. The seriously injured mother, who originally called 911, survived her wounds. The suspect was transported to a local hospital and pronounced deceased.

**Sergeant Jay Van Kam, Officer Larry Bankston, Officer Blake Beasley, Officer James Declaire**
On November 5th, 2016, at about 8:30pm, Sergeant Matthew Brukbacher, Sergeant Jay Van Kam, Officer Larry Bankston, Officer Blake Beasley, Officer Scott Benedict, Officer James Declaire, Officer Brian Ross, Officer David Sanderson with K-9 Draco, and Recruit Officer Alex Eisaman responded to a possible hostage situation at 5388 South Harvest Way. The officers observed a suspect holding his father hostage at gunpoint with a shotgun inside the living room of the house. Officers requested additional resources and a crisis entry team was formed. As notifications were being made, the suspect racked the shotgun while still holding his father at gunpoint. Based on this act and grave concern for the hostage, the crisis team entered the rear of the home through an open sliding door. This team was led by Sergeant Brukbacher and consisted of Officer Sanderson with Draco, Officer Ross, Officer Benedict, and Officer Eisaman. The
suspect put the shotgun onto the couch just prior to officer contact. The suspect was safely taken into custody and the victim rescued with only minor injuries. The suspect was held on 2nd Degree Kidnap, 3rd Degree Assault on an At Risk Adult and Felony Menacing.

**Sergeant Bryce Jackson (Denver Police Department)**

On November 8, 2016, at about 11:20 AM, a suspect, Juan Ramos, drove to the area of 6th Avenue and Peoria Street and shot his ex-girlfriend’s new boyfriend. Witnesses on scene were able to identify the getaway car. Members of the Department’s Fugitive Apprehension and Surveillance Team (FAST) and the Strategic Response Team (SRT) located the suspect’s house in Denver and set up on it while waiting for Denver Metro SWAT to arrive. Undercover Denver Police Department units also arrived to maintain surveillance on the house. An SRT element comprised of Sergeant Cassidee Carlson, Officer Erick Ortiz, Officer Stephen Edwards and Officer Jeremy W. Jenkins, sat in an unmarked truck down the street and formulated a plan for an immediate assault of the suspect’s vehicle if he should try to leave, coordinating with FAST Officers James Giordano and Emily Hitchings.

At about 11:50 AM, the suspect exited his house carrying an infant car seat and headed toward his car. Officer Ortiz started driving the SRT truck toward the suspect’s house. Officer Edwards was in the front passenger seat, Sergeant Carlson was behind him and Officer Jenkins was seated behind Officer Ortiz. The suspect put the infant seat into his car. As the truck slowly approached the house and was about 100 feet away, the suspect identified that it was a police vehicle and armed himself. The suspect opened fire on the SRT truck, striking the front passenger door and the windshield. One round passed through the windshield and struck Officer Ortiz on the right side of his face. Sergeant Carlson and Officer Edwards engaged the suspect with gun fire and eliminated the threat. Officer Ortiz stopped the vehicle about ten feet from the suspect’s vehicle and calmly exited the truck, letting everyone know he had been shot. Officer Jenkins and Sergeant Carlson took tactical positions on the house and suspect car.

Officer Paul Timmons, Officer Giordano, Officer Hitchings, and Denver Police Sergeant Bryce Jackson went to the aide of Officer Ortiz. They loaded Officer Ortiz into Sergeant Jackson’s police car. Officer Timmons got in the back with Officer Ortiz to hold pressure on the wound while Officer Giordano held Officer Ortiz’s hand and called out the car’s location to coordinate road closures. They drove to the hospital escorted by Officer Hitchings.

**Officer Michael Tilton**

In the days leading up to April 25, 2016, several armed robberies had occurred in Aurora and surrounding jurisdictions. The suspect in the robberies was armed with a handgun and was targeting convenience stores and gas stations. On April 25, 2016 the robberies continued with two more locations in District 1 being robbed. At 0438 hours Officer Michael Tilton observed a vehicle matching the robbery suspect vehicle and began following it. Officer Tilton advised that the vehicle was attempting to elude him and a pursuit was authorized. Officer Tilton and Officer Delbert Tisdale began to pursue the vehicle. The seventeen minute chase started in the neighborhoods along the Colfax corridor, south on Potomac Street from 11th Avenue, and east on 6th Avenue into District Two. Officers Stephenson Cary, Mark Moore, Cassie Longnecker, Ryan Marker, Sgt. Phillip Rathbun, and Sgt. Jeff Longnecker all joined the pursuit at that time. Speeds during the chase were as high as 100 miles per hour. The suspect vehicle made a u-turn after Airpark Blvd and drove head-on at pursuing officers. When the suspect vehicle got to Powhaton Road the driver lost control and crashed. The driver of the vehicle jumped out of the car and ran down
an embankment onto Interstate 70. Officers chased after the suspect and put themselves in grave danger, as they did not know if the suspect was armed and traffic was driving by at highway speeds. When the suspect ran from the car all of the officers chased after him except for Officer Longnecker who checked the interior of the suspect vehicle. She located a second suspect in the front passenger seat and held him at gunpoint until officers responded back to her location and took him into custody. Officer Tisdale did an outstanding job of calling this pursuit out. He was very calm and clear on the radio allowing others to easily understand his transmissions related to direction of travel, speeds, road conditions, and traffic congestion. This was a necessary and dangerous pursuit that all of these officers undertook in a very professional manner. The outcome of the incident resulted in both suspects being charged with multiple felony counts of armed robbery.

**Sergeant Chris Amsler**

In March of 2015, the Aurora Police Department through the Chief of Police, Nicholas Metz, identified a number of initiatives to enhance its relationship with the community. One such initiative was the designation of a Recruiting Strategies Committee (RSC) comprised of internal members and private sector business partners working together to develop departmental recruiting strategies and approaches. The RSC was tasked with making recommendations to the Chief of Police, seeking not only to enhance the overall quality and quantity of applicants, but also to improve the diversification among applicants in an effort to build an organization that more closely mirrors Aurora’s multi-cultural community. The RSC was also directed to identify prospective community partners committed to forging strong public-private partnerships that could implement the recommendations. After nine months of collaboration, the RSC crafted a comprehensive report that will serve as the department’s recruiting blueprint for the foreseeable future and beyond. For providing an exceptional contribution to the progress of the department by performing his duties in an unusually effective manner, Sergeant Chris Amsler was awarded a Chief’s Commendation.

**Officer Richard Hargrove, Officer Thomas Gallimore**

On March 3rd, 2016, Officer Ricardo Hargrove and Thomas Gallimore responded to 17474 E. Temple Dr. in regards to a family disturbance. Christian Miller was upset at his mom, Linnea Miller, and punched a couple of holes in some walls inside the residence. Ms. Miller is a single mom and did not have the money or skills to fix the holes so Officers Hargrove and Gallimore asked if they could come in early on March 4th, 2016, to show Christian how to repair drywall, which they did while paying for the materials themselves. The officers were able to establish a relationship with Christian and explained there are different ways to vent his frustrations while not damaging property or disrespecting his mother. Ms. Miller was very appreciative of the officer’s efforts to help her and her son. This was a great example of the kindness our officers display on a daily basis and both officers received a Chief’s Commendation.

**Chief’s Unit Citation**

The Chief’s Unit Citation may be awarded by the Chief of Police to an entire unit whose members perform their assigned duties in an unusually effective manner. The Chief of Police may recognize units comprised of officers from the Aurora Police Department as well as other organizations, or multi-jurisdictional task forces, for this award.
The department presented three **Chief’s Unit Citations** in 2016.

**Special Victims Unit: Sergeant Damon Vaz, Agent Lana Maddox, Officer Travis Lore, Officer Sandy Moreno, Officer Bobbi Jo Olson, Officer Leslie Roberts, Officer Jim Seneca**

In 2015, Colorado enacted new legislation regarding mandatory reporting of elder abuse in Colorado. With this new mandate the Aurora Police Department realized the need to create a new unit to deal with the influx of new elder abuse cases being reported. Thus, in September of 2015 a new unit was formed called the Special Victims Unit. Sergeant Damon Vaz was selected to lead the team. The members of the team were hand-picked, the majority of the positions coming from the Officer rank. The team was given the daunting task of writing policies, deciding how best to handle cases, reaching out to stakeholders, and educating the agency about the new legislation. In less than 2 years the Special Victims Unit has far exceeded the initial expectations set for them and have become the model team in the region for handling elder abuse cases. The team has successfully handled an abundance of serious cases involving elderly and intellectually disabled individuals. The entire team should be commended for their commitment to assisting those who cannot assist themselves and creating a much valued asset to the Aurora Police Department.

**Traffic Section DUI Unit**

On May 25, 2016, Officer Gomez and Officer Marker attend the annual Mothers Against Drunk Driving (M.A.D.D.) awards ceremony. Officers Gomez and Marker received the "Outstanding Team Dedication" award for DUI enforcement. In 2015, both officers made a combined total of 967 DUI arrests. This number of arrests is amazing considering that these were the only two officers assigned to the DUI team for the vast majority of 2015. This is the fourth year in a row that the Aurora Police Department DUI Team earned this prestigious award from M.A.D.D.

**Gang Unit: Detective Nate Meier, Detective Pete Szuch, Detective Pete Page, Officer Jonathan Dennis, Officer Brent Maksyn, Officer Jonathan McCants, Officer Doug Pearson, Officer Randall Ricks, Officer Eugene Van Dyk**

Members of the Gang Intervention Unit were involved in a complex investigation into a series of shootings which were linked by NIBIN and involved the same firearm. It was believed the suspects in these shootings were Byron Hendricks and Sheldon Long. Both have an extensive criminal history and are documented gang members. Everyone in the unit played their part in the eventual arrest of both subjects.

Detective Pete Page established probable cause for the arrest of both parties in a menacing case. Both subjects were involved in shootings in Denver and Thornton. Hendricks had an active warrant for a shooting in Thornton. Advanced investigative techniques were utilized in an attempt to locate Hendricks. Eventually both Hendricks and Long were captured.

Detective Pete Szuch led the shooting investigations. Through the efforts of the entire unit, several shootings were cleared and charges were filed relating to those cases. The vehicle used in several of the shootings was located and seized. This was exceptional work by the entire Gang Intervention Unit and they are commended for their hard work and efforts.
Certificate of Appreciation – Citizen’s Award

The Certificate of Appreciation, Citizen’s Award may be awarded by the Chief of Police to any citizen who renders valuable, courageous, or heroic assistance to members of the Aurora Police Department.

The department presented 15 Certificates of Appreciation in 2016.

Kimberly Bond and Araceli Hernandez-Greco

On January 14, 2017, in the wake of the tragic David Puckett case, an autistic and diabetic six year old boy ran away from his foster parents’ house in the 4200 block of South Halifax Way. The boy had been missing for fifteen minutes before the police were called as his care takers tried to find him. Officers were not able to initially locate the child and additional resources were about to be called in when he came back home care of fifteen year old Kimberly Bond and 16 year old Araceli Hernandez-Greco. Kimberly and Araceli were driving in the area of East Quincy Avenue and South Picadilly Street and saw the young boy walking by himself. Concerned for his welfare, the young ladies stopped to check on him. After determining that he needed to go back home, they called Kimberly’s mother who picked up the child and drove him home with them. Kimberly and Araceli did not know the boy and acted on their

AirLife Denver, Arapahoe County Coroner’s Office, Aurora Fire Rescue, Aurora Public Schools, Cambria Hotel and Suites, Colorado Department of Transportation, Chik-Fil-A, Children’s Hospital Colorado, Judge Shawn Day, Falck Rocky Mountain, Hinkley High School, M&M Towing, Ms. Brenda Peeples

Officer Kevin Deichsel, Officer Carolyn Renaud, Officer Aaron Bunch and Department Videographer Jon Billingsley worked together with many outside partners to produce a powerful video based on the “Every Fifteen Minutes” Program. The program is designed to educate teens on the dangers of impaired driving by providing a dramatic real-life experience for students.

Over the course of more than a year, Officer Kevin Deichsel met with and solicited participation from numerous policy-makers, administrators and stakeholders in the community to support this presentation. He presented his idea to APD administration, City management, City Council, AFD and others who all supported his efforts. He then went to work getting other organizations throughout the city to help facilitate the multiple roles necessary in carrying out the program.

APD School Resource Officers began to work with the school administrators and students who would be the actors in the presentation; this also included participation with the student’s parents who would be involved in the program, which includes:

- APD Traffic Officers respond to a "crash" and investigate
- AFD response to the “crash”
- M & M Towing to supply the crashed cars and clean-up after
- Arapahoe County Coroner’s response and tour of their facility
- Falck Ambulance response and transportation of injured parties
- Health One Air Life response
- Children’s Hospital treatment of injured parties
- APD’s Victim Services Unit who helped with victim family notifications
- APD Volunteers
- Cambria Hotel and Suites to provide overnight accommodations for the students and families
Kevin completed all of this which necessitated the coordination of over one hundred people. He also reached out to the local news agencies to solicit coverage.

Officers Carolyn “C.J.” Renaud and Aaron Bunch coordinated much of the activity that revolved around the school and students. This required working with the school administration, the selection of students to participate in the program, participating in the retreat, and coordinating other SRO’s for notifications.

The program was presented on April 3rd and 4th with the “dead” students being removed from classrooms every minutes by the “Grim Reaper” (played by Sergeant Poole), SRO’s and a mock crash and emergency response. The following day, a video was presented to the school.

The presentation has garnered great response from the community and Officer Deichsel is receiving requests from many people wanting more information on the program and inquiries as to when it may be presented again.

Because of their efforts, many people were able to learn the possible consequences of driving impaired or distracted without having to live through this actual scenario.

**Community Commitment Certificate**

This may be awarded to members who, through their own efforts, display an unusually effective manner of employing the Aurora Police Department’s community commitment philosophy.

The department presented four **Community Commitment Certificates** in 2016.

**Officer Aaron Bunch, Officer Kevin Deichsel, Officer Carolyn Renaud, Videographer Jon Billingsley**

Officer Kevin Deichsel, Officer Carolyn Renaud, Officer Aaron Bunch and Department Videographer Jon Billingsley worked together with many outside partners to produce a powerful video based on the “Every Fifteen Minutes” Program. The program is designed to educate teens on the dangers of impaired driving by providing a dramatic real-life experience for students.

Over the course of more than a year, Officer Kevin Deichsel met with and solicited participation from numerous policy-makers, administrators and stakeholders in the community to support this presentation. He presented his idea to APD administration, City management, City Council, AFD and others who all supported his efforts. He then went to work getting other organizations throughout the city to help facilitate the multiple roles necessary in carrying out the program:

APD School Resource Officers began to work with the school administrators and students who would be the actors in the presentation; this also included participation with the student’s parents who would be involved in the program, which includes:

- APD Traffic Officers to respond to the “crash” and investigate
- AFD response to the “crash”
• M & M Towing to supply the crashed cars and clean-up after
• Arapahoe County Coroner’s response and tour of their facility
• Falck Ambulance response and transportation of injured parties
• Health One Air Life response
• Children’s Hospital treatment of injured parties
• APD’s Victim Services Unit who helped with victim family notifications
• APD Volunteers
• Cambria Hotel and Suites to provide overnight accommodations for the students and families
• Chik-fil-A to provide food
• CDOT and MADD
• APD Video Services

Kevin completed all of this which necessitated the coordination of over one hundred people. He also reached out to the local news agencies to solicit coverage.

Officers Carolyn “C.J.” Renaud and Aaron Bunch coordinated much of the activity that revolved around the school and students. This required working with the school administration, the selection of students to participate in the program, participating in the retreat, and coordinating other SRO’s for notifications.

The program was presented on April 3rd and 4th with the “dead” students being removed from classrooms every minutes by the “Grim Reaper” (played by Sergeant Poole), SRO’s and a mock crash and emergency response. The following day, a video was presented to the school.

The presentation has garnered great response from the community and Officer Deichsel is receiving requests from many people wanting more information on the program and inquiries as to when it may be presented again.

Because of their efforts, many people were able to learn the possible consequences of driving impaired or distracted without having to live through this actual scenario.

**Excellence Award**

This award is presented to a career service member who continuously seeks excellence in practice and often “takes it to the next level.”

The department presented four Excellence Awards in 2016.

**Administrative Technician Kellie Craft**

Kellie Craft provides tremendous support for the multiple teams that she serves. For her primary job with District 1, she keeps track of the budget, equipment, purchases, supplies, seizure fund requests and needs and all the other tasks that are expected of an Administrative Technician. Kellie is simply superb at everything she does. She is extraordinarily organized and efficient. She completed the city’s fifteen month Advanced Supervision course and was co-president of her class. Kellie is the chair of the civilian committee and regularly meets with the Chief’s staff about non-sworn member’s needs. To address a lack of training available for non-sworn employees, Kellie created a non-sworn in-service that will be delivered beginning in the third quarter of 2017. Kellie is on the Department Awards Board, the Yearbook committee, serves
as a scribe on SWAT callouts and is on the Emergency Operations Center Logistics team. Her recent accomplishments include securing funding for a workout room in District 1, creating a de-escalation techniques poster, and revising the safety evacuation plan for the District 1 building.

Kellie does everything to the utmost of her ability. Anything less than perfection is unacceptable to her. If Kellie gets involved in a project the organization can rest easy knowing it will be done beyond anyone’s expectation. There is only one thing that Kellie is so far incapable of doing, and that is saying “no.”

Administrative Specialist Ruth Brassell
Ruth Brassell has been the Administrative Specialist for both the Community Resource Section and the Professional Standards Section concurrently since 2013. Over that period of time, she has sought and received additional responsibility serving both sections and initiatives. Among her duties outside of her normal job, she assists with the Citizen's Police Academy, the Teen Police Academy, the International Teen Academy, and the Senior Citizen's Police Academy. She assists with emergency operations in the Department Operations Center. Ruth has become a point of contact for Fred Pryor Seminars, allowing other employees the opportunity to attend discounted workplace computer training. Ruth helped in the creation of the Special Victims Unit, especially in data collection and analysis.

During her tenure in the PSS and CRS, Ms. Brassell has demonstrated that she is a critical thinker who recognizes areas for improvement for employees and citizens alike. She readily recognizes current areas for improvement and anticipates the ill effects if conditions do not improve. In this light, she is creative and relentless in her commitment to improve the work environment not only for herself but for others—she truly takes it to the next level—and it is a challenge to keep up with her.

Administrative Technician Nancy Walker
Nancy Walker has been assigned to District 3 as an Administrative Technician for nearly 4 years and has become a vital component to the efficient management of the district. Nancy does not just show up and put in her time, she is dedicated to the success of District 3 by constantly looking for ways to keep everything running smoothly and make others’ jobs easier. She is friendly and responsive to everyone who works in District 3 or uses the various meeting rooms in the facility. Nancy recently demonstrated collaboration, creativity, and a desire to champion the positive work of others by creating a display for awards received by District 3 personnel. Typically these awards are presented in Patrol briefings or unit meetings and only the individual’s team or watch learns of it. The display created by Nancy is located in the main hallway of the building and allows everyone to recognize excellence in action.

Senior Crime Analyst Dawn Tollakson
Senior Crime Analyst Dawn Tollakson routinely performs her duties above and beyond what is expected, taking what she does to the next level. She is a self-starter who applies her extensive knowledge in Crime Analysis and Law Enforcement Operations to solve problems quickly. Recent examples of her excellent performance involved several metro-wide aggravated motor vehicle thefts. Working with Parole, she was able to place the suspect, Mr. Tremaine Spears at the scene of three motor vehicle thefts and other key locations via his ankle monitor GPS records. This information was pivotal in his arrest. Additionally Ms. Tollakson was instrumental in the identification of the Rich Boy Gang (RBG). She worked with the Gang Intelligence Unit to identify this group and its hierarchy, playing a key role in gathering and publishing information which resulted in several arrests. Ms. Tollakson handles a large workload, consistently being
proactive in identifying crime trends in the city and metro area, making positive suggestions on how to address these issues. She has established many networking contacts throughout the state, communicating regularly with them to address issues of mutual concern. Ms. Tollakson is a true professional who demonstrates her dedication on a daily basis. Her excellence in performance is a huge asset to the Aurora Police Department and the people we serve.

**Innovation Award**

The innovation award recognizes a member who has demonstrated or accomplished a core component of the Aurora Police Department. Criteria include: suggesting or developing new work methods that increase productivity; developing an effective solution to an existing difficult problem; developing and implementing a plan for the good of the community; or, generating novel and valuable ideas and using these ideas to improve processes, methods, systems, programs or services for his or her team or department.

The department presented three **Innovation Awards** in 2016.

**Property Technician Cathleen Craft**

As a Property and Evidence Technician with the Aurora Police Department Property and Evidence Unit, Technician Cathleen Craft has been instrumental in the implementation of a process to ensure the accurate tracking of Property Dispositions from Aurora Police members. The members review their cases and determine what evidence should be retained or which items are no longer needed for evidentiary purposes. After this information is returned to the technicians, they are able to see what outstanding items are remaining and set a date to have the members review these items at a later date. By setting date parameters and having the ability to review items on hand, we can dispose of items on a regular basis and reduce overcrowding in our storage locations.

Technician Craft created an excel spreadsheet to track the information returned from members regarding the disposition of property on a given case. The spreadsheet is broken down by type of item to be disposed and includes all pertinent information for the technicians to be able to review and pull the item for disposal. Technician Craft has set the spreadsheet up so that the disposition form returned by the members is accessible via a hyperlink from the spreadsheet. The spreadsheet is saved to our Property SharePoint page so all in the Unit can access it. Once property items that are ready to be disposed are added to the spreadsheet they are reviewed and approved by the Property Unit Supervisor as a measure of quality control. Prior to the creation of this spreadsheet, there was no organized method of tracking what items have received authorization for disposal which contributed to a backlog of items pending destruction.

Since the implementation of the spreadsheet, the technicians save time by having all information on hand to be disposed as well as location of the items designated for disposal and the authorization for disposal. This process has resulted in better communication between technicians and supervisors of the unit by decreasing duplication of work and organizing the disposal process. Technician Crafts’ attention to detail, vast knowledge of computer programs, willingness to take on any project assigned, and innovative ideas will save the Property Unit man hours and in turn save valued monetary funds which can be earmarked for better departmental use.
Administrative Specialist Deborah Burgess and Administrative Specialist Lisa McKown
The Aurora Police Department’s Court Liaison team receives approximately 25,000 subpoenas each year. Court Liaison staff, Lisa McKown and Deborah Burgess, were responsible to manually enter, date stamp and deliver the subpoenas to the 783 members of the police department. In June of 2016, Lisa and Deborah were instrumental in rolling out the new Colorado District Attorney’s e-subpoena system for the State of Colorado Court system, a small fraction of all subpoenas issued yearly. Lisa and Deborah became department administrators for this new system and subsequently developed new policy and procedures for this newly acquired program.

After becoming proficient in this system, understanding the efficiencies and determining it would be more convenient for the officers to receive all subpoenas through the e-subpoena system, Lisa and Deborah approached the Municipal Court Administrators and the Deputy City Attorney about developing the same type of delivery system for Municipal subpoenas. After explaining the process and showing the efficiencies of the State court e-subpoena system, a new program was developed and now all subpoenas are being delivered to members of the department by e-subpoenas. This has allowed officers to determine in real time if they are needed in court. This has also resulted in a nominal decrease in court overtime, a positive impact on officers’ personal lives and allows Lisa and Deborah to work on other tasks within the office.

Due to Lisa and Deborah’s innovate suggestion and the development of new work methods resulting in increased productivity as well as time and monetary savings.

Informal Commander’s Commendations

Commander’s Commendation Certificate
The Commander’s Commendation Certificate may be awarded by Section and Bureau Command Officers to those members who, through their own efforts, perform their jobs in such a manner as to reflect high quality and professionalism in performance of their duties.

The department issued 89 Commander’s Commendations in 2016.

Officer Chris Villanueva
On July 29, 2016, several District 2 officers responded to a court order violation call at 14180 E Gunnison Place. A male party had been previously diagnosed with paranoid schizophrenia and bi-polar disorder and was issued a court order on July 28, 2016, as a result of acting irrationally, walking around the house with a gas can, and threatening to burn the house down.

The male returned to the residence on July 29, 2016, in violation of the court order and, again, was behaving irrationally. His family members were able to safely exit the residence as he proceeded to barricade the doors of the residence. Due to the prior actions involving the gas can, the restraining order, and the family’s concerns, Lt. Hatfield requested crisis negotiators respond to the scene. Officer Villanueva and several other negotiators responded. Officer Villanueva was the first to arrive and volunteered to be the primary negotiator. Officer Villanueva used his crisis negotiator training to build rapport with the male, which was very difficult due to his erratic behavior. The male eventually set a fire.
inside the residence causing a small explosion. The male came out of the residence a few seconds later, unharmed, and surrendered to officers.

Officer Villanueva was awarded for his continuous efforts to engage the male who was experiencing a mental health crisis. Officer Villanueva’s expertise as a trained negotiator averted a possible tragic ending to this incident.

**Sergeant Gene Salberg, Officer Scott Benedict, Officer Matthew T. Green, Officer Brian Ross, Officer Amber Roberts, Officer Joseph Hess**

On July 8, 2016, at approximately 2105 hours, Sergeant Gene Salberg and Officers Scott Benedict, Matthew T. Green, Brian Ross, Amber Roberts, and Joseph Hess responded to 4050 South Atchison Way concerning a report of a despondent individual who wanted APD officers to assist him in committing suicide. This was the second APD response to this address for the subject within the hour. During the first response, officers on scene discovered that the subject had barricaded himself in the basement and Sergeant Salberg made the decision to not go inside and force a potentially deadly confrontation. While en route to the address the second time, call notes indicated the suicidal subject had mixed some chemicals together in an attempt to kill himself by inhaling the fumes. The father of the subject reported the subject was outside of the residence sitting on his bicycle and stated the subject wanted APD officers to shoot him. Sergeant Salberg arrived on scene and deployed his less lethal shotgun while directing Officers Benedict, Green, Ross, Roberts and Hess to set up at the end of the street. Officers found the subject hiding nearby in some bushes holding two large kitchen knives; one pointed to his neck and the other to his chest. When confronted, the subject demanded that the officers shoot him. Efforts by these officers to diffuse the situation failed and numerous commands to drop the knives went unheeded. As the subject started to stand up, Sergeant Salberg fired his less lethal shotgun striking the subject twice, which incapacitated him. Due to their teamwork and quick actions, Sergeant Gene Salberg, Officer Scott Benedict, Officer Matthew T. Green, Officer Brian Ross, Officer Amber Roberts, and Officer Joseph Hess were able to safely take the subject into protective custody before he could harm himself or anyone else and likely prevented an officer involved shooting from taking place.

Sergeant Gene Salberg, Officer Scott Benedict, Officer Matthew T. Green, Officer Brian Ross, Officer Amber Roberts, and Officer Joseph Hess were awarded for the outstanding manner in which they performed their duties under extremely stressful circumstances.

**Officer James Salazar**

On October 06, 2016, PAR Officer James Salazar responded to a suspicious occurrence call located in the area of Southshore Parkway and East Ottawa Drive. As the investigation proceeded, a damaged/vandalized vehicle was located. A citizen contacted Officer Salazar and provided Officer Salazar with suspect information, as the citizen had witnessed the vandalism and took a picture of the three suspects. Officer Salazar determined that the suspects’ vehicle was a reported steal out of Arapahoe County. Officer Salazar sent the photograph of the suspects to District 3 patrol officers who located individuals matching the suspects’ description in the area. Officer Salazar took charge and properly completed a field show-up which led to the identification and subsequent arrests of the suspects. Additionally, Officer Salazar conducted interviews with the juvenile suspects and their respective parents to successfully solve and clear this case.
Officer Salazar was awarded for his proactive police work, excellent investigation and follow-up which resulted in the apprehension of three suspects and the clearance of this criminal episode.

**Officer Jason Moore**
On June 26, 2016, at 10:30 am, the Colorado State Bank and Trust at 15490 East Hampden Avenue reported an armed robbery. The suspect was described as a heavyset white male, approximately 40 years old, with brown-gray hair and bow legs; wearing a camouflage baseball cap, bright orange t-shirt, camouflage shorts and tennis shoes. Witnesses saw the suspect leave in a yellow colored taxi with green writing.

Officer Jason Moore responded from the area of Iliff Avenue and Chambers Road, and while en route, he spotted a yellow taxi with green writing turning from northbound Chambers Road onto westbound Iliff Avenue. Officer Moore caught up to the taxi and observed the taxi’s backseat passenger matched the description of the bank robbery suspect. Officer Moore stopped the taxi and held the suspect at gunpoint. The suspect, upon seeing Officer Moore, exclaimed, "That was fast!" Officers took the suspect into custody and located a large amount of cash in his pocket at the time of arrest. The suspect subsequently confessed to robbing the bank.

Officer Jason Moore was awarded for his quick response and excellent perception and analysis that resulted in the apprehension of a dangerous criminal.

**Officer Amber Roberts**
On June 3rd, 2016, Officer Amber Roberts observed a vehicle make several illegal traffic violations that began in the vicinity of East Iliff Avenue and South Buckley Road. Upon making a traffic stop on the vehicle and contacting the driver/suspect (Joshua Franklin), Officer Roberts observed what she thought to be the end of a handgun protruding from under the front passenger seat of the vehicle. Officer Roberts immediately removed Franklin from the vehicle. In doing so, Officer Roberts observed behaviors exhibited by Franklin that were indicative of him possibly being under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs. Officer Roberts determined there was probable cause to arrest Franklin for DUI and Prohibited Use of a Weapon. A search of Franklin’s vehicle led to the recovery of five firearms, a 75 round drum magazine, numerous ammunition magazines, and hundreds of rounds of ammunition for the aforementioned firearms. Further investigation by Officer Roberts revealed that prior to the traffic stop, Franklin was involved in a verbal altercation with his stepfather and threatened to harm him.

Officer Amber Roberts was awarded for her proactive police work, excellent perception and analysis, which resulted in the apprehension of a potentially dangerous and violent criminal.

**Officer Juan Gonzalez and Officer Don Wilcox**
On Sunday December 4th, 2016, at approximately 1700 hours Officers Don Wilcox and Juan Gonzalez responded to the address of 1056 South Salem St. Unit 215 on a report of a welfare check. Call notes indicated that a 7 year old child was calling on behalf of her father who was unresponsive.

The male was subsequently pronounced deceased. Information was obtained that the male may have been deceased with his daughter present for an extended period of time. No other individuals were present in the unit during the day of the incident. Officers Wilcox and Gonzalez were extremely tactful
when gleaning information from the child. Contact was subsequently made with the mother of the child who responded to the location to take custody of the child.

Although not noted in the supplemental report, Officer Wilcox learned that the child had not eaten anything during the day in question. Officer Wilcox, without being prompted, left the location and purchased some food for the child with his own money. He returned back and stayed with the child and the child’s mother until the coroner arrived.

Both Officers were commended on their response and demeanor while dealing with such a sensitive situation. Their actions while dealing with the family, specifically the child are a prime example of outstanding community relations.

**Officer William Hummel and Officer Patty Southwick**

For the second year in a row District 1 PAR Officers were tasked with putting together a community event at the new Stanley Aviation retail center. The event called Santa at Stanley involved APD Officers bringing Santa Claus to Stanley to meet with children. The event aimed to provide positive community interaction with the new businesses, families, and Officers. This year Officer William Hummel was tasked with organizing the event which was held on Dec. 18th, 2016. The event was a huge success and much more involved than the prior year. Officer Hummel did an outstanding job of organizing many personnel, units, and equipment. He was even able to convince Officers Dan and Patty Southwick to be Mr. and Mrs. Claus. The response from the businesses and the community was overwhelmingly positive and reflected very well on the entire Aurora Police Department. Officer Hummel is commended for putting together such a great event.

**Officer Joshua Perrott**

On August 23, 2016, Officer Joshua Perrott was working District 1 when he advised he had possibly identified the shooting suspect reference APD Case # 2016-32336, which occurred at the 7-11 located at 2220 South Peoria Street, on the night of August 14, 2016.

Officer Perrott observed a red Chevrolet Impala with dark tinted windows in the vicinity of East Alameda Avenue and South Potomac Street. Officer Perrott was aware that the aforementioned incident involved a similar suspect vehicle. He observed a minor traffic infraction and took the opportunity to conduct a traffic stop on the vehicle to further his investigation. He contacted the sole female occupant, positively identified her, and subsequently discovered that she could not legally operate a vehicle, he asked if she knew someone who could respond to the scene to operate the vehicle legally. The female advised that she could have her boyfriend, who held a valid driver’s license, respond to operate the vehicle. The male subsequently responded and was positively identified through NCIC/CCIC and found to have a valid driver’s license. Officer Perrott retrieved the email containing the BOLO of the shooting and determined the male depicted in the original bolo matched the description of the male he was currently in contact with.

Officer Perrott completed a detailed Field Interview Report and notified the Gang Intervention Unit. The information collected on scene, along with the body camera footage captured during the contact, lead the Gang Intervention Unit to identify the suspect reference the shooting incident. Because of Officer Perrott’s pro-active policing and his willingness to further his investigation he developed critical
information that lead GIU Investigators to the suspect. Officer Perrott was awarded for his tenacious investigation, attention to detail and his willingness to go the extra mile to identify a shooting suspect.

**Officer Jeremy Stenersen and Officer Nicholas Brungardt**

On August 10th, 2016, Officer Jeremy Stenersen and Officer Nicholas Brungardt responded to a report of a physical domestic. Dispatch advised that the female was being bitten and choked by the male suspect. Upon arrival, the male opened the door, saw the uniformed officers and slammed the door. The officers recognized the dangers associated with someone being choked and gave multiple orders to the male to open the door. The male refused and the officers then forced entry into the residence. The male was near the door attempting to hide. He was taken into custody after a brief struggle. The officers then conducted an investigation into the domestic violence incident and determined that the victim had indeed been choked until she lost consciousness. The case is significant in that the officers immediately identified that the facts for the elements of the newly established statute of 2nd Degree Assault (strangulation). A follow-up interview with the victim by a district detective revealed that the victim was actively being assaulted when the officers were on scene. The detective commended the officers for not only their decisive actions in making entry given the exigent circumstances, but also the professionalism they displayed during a physical confrontation when taking the suspect into custody. The detective also noted the high quality of the officers’ investigation and reports. It is the opinion of the officers’ sergeant and the investigating detective that had Officer Stenersen and Officer Brungardt not forced entry into the home, the victim may have sustained much more serious injuries. There is no doubt that the officers’ actions prevented this incident from becoming more dangerous for both the victim and her children in the home. The victim was very thankful to the officers for their actions and professionalism. The officer’s conduct during this incident reflects highly on their level of professionalism and commitment to the safety of the community.

**Officer Rick Garcia, Officer Tim Jeffrey, Officer Jonathan Carelock, Officer Douglas Stark, Sergeant Steve White, Sergeant Alfred Roberson**

On July 25th, 2016, officers responded to a reported bank robbery with shots fired at the Wells Fargo Bank. Upon arrival, officers learned that an armored car guard was reloading an ATM machine when he was shot at by a suspect during an attempted robbery and the guard returned fire. In all, 19 shots were exchanged with the suspect being struck once in the left arm. The suspect then fled on foot into an apartment complex, leaving a blood trail and dumping his costume and pistol along the route. Sergeants Alfred Roberson, Steve White, and Officer Douglas Stark were able to follow the blood trail to its conclusion. The trail ended at a hallway entrance to several apartments. Through the process of elimination, Officer Stark, Jonathan Carelock, and Tim Jeffrey searched two of the apartments and were able to clear them while allowing the families to evacuate. Officer Rick Garcia joined the entry team and the team was able to cover the apartment from the apartment across the hall. Orders were given at the suspect apartment for the occupants to step outside. After some time, a female and juvenile male came outside and confirmed that the suspect was inside the apartment. Further orders were made and the suspect peacefully stepped outside and was taken into custody by Officer Jeffrey. For their quick response, teamwork, and scene investigation, Sergeant Roberson, White, and Officers Stark, Carelock, Jeffrey, and Garcia were awarded a commander’s commendation for their efforts that concluded in taking a dangerous suspect into custody.
Agent Jason McDonald, Officer Paul Cancino, Officer Darwin Hanley, Officer Christopher Neiman, Officer Jonathan Dediemar, Crime Analyst Robbin Hemphill, and Crime Analyst Jamie Newsum

On July 7th, 2016, Officer Paul Cancino responded to the local Metro PCS cellphone store on an attempted robbery call. A black male and white female, possibly working together, tried to rob the business. The male pointed a handgun at the clerk demanding money, while the female pretended to be a customer and案子 the business. The suspects ultimately left the store with no money since there was no money in the cash register at this time of day. Agent Jason McDonald retrieved surveillance video of the attempt, created still photographs of the robbers, and sent the photos to Crime Analyst Robbin Hemphill. Crime Analyst Hemphill created a crime BOLO for APD dissemination. Officer John Dediemar saw the BOLO and recognized the suspects from an earlier contact he had with them a year prior. Dediemar relayed his information to Crime Analyst Jamie Newsum. Crime Analysts Newsum and Hemphill were able to link the suspects to three other recent robberies. Agent McDonald reviewed mugshots of the two suspects and confirmed a match with tattoos listed on the males arrest record with tattoos which appear on the robbery video.

On July 23rd, 2016, the male and female suspects were seen walking in the 14900 block of E. Ohio Avenue by Officer Chris Neiman. Neiman recognized the male from earlier contacts and arrested him for an outstanding Arapahoe County warrant. On July 20th, Officers Murray Hanley, and Paul Cancino had arrested the female for trespassing at the Oakridge Apartments (just down the street from the Metro PCS robbery). Agent McDonald then obtained positive lineup ID’s from the clerk in the robbery. While the male was still in jail, McDonald file a case charging him with Attempted Aggravated Robbery. Investigation is continuing on the female’s role in the robberies. Due to APD’s dedicated Crime Analysts, Patrol Officers, and Agents, and their thorough, watchful teamwork, a dangerous armed robber was apprehended.

Officer Ashley Orr, Officer Everett Williams, Officer Katie Brugler, Officer Bridget Johnson, Officer Darren Martinez, Officer Frederick Lang, Officer Jacob Tubbs, Officer Daniel Madera, Officer Todd Alscher, Sergeant Tyler Reissland, and Sergeant Seth Robertson

Officers responded to a family dispute involving a handgun at 17th and Norfolk. At the reported address, the reporting party was hiding underneath a vehicle. Officers extensively checked the area but were unable to find anyone or any evidence of the incident. Officers determined a better address and traveled to that area. As the first officers and sergeants arrived on scene, a suspicious male was observed standing in the street. Officers made contact with the male and were walking past a Mercedes parked in the street occupied by two persons. It was unknown if the vehicle or occupants were related to the call and the officers remained focused on the male in the street. Suddenly the Mercedes engine started and accelerated off the road, into a side yard, slamming into a tree. All of the officers’ attention were then divided between the vehicle and the male. The officers separated into two groups to contact and detain all persons. As officers were doing this, two males were observed standing nearby watching police actions. The driver, James Draper, and passenger of the vehicle had no connection to the dispatched call but Draper was found to be a gang member with an extensive criminal history. When officers checked him, he was in possession of a handgun, six pounds of marijuana and four grams of cocaine. It was determined he was a convicted felon and was held with no bond as a special offender. The officers concluded the male on the street was the reporting party. When detained, he became belligerent and aggressive towards officers requiring officers to forcefully place him in a patrol car. He further refused to cooperate or speak with police about his original 911 call and was later criminally charged due to his...
behavior with police. When contact was finally made at the correct address, one of the males watching police earlier was found to be the suspect of the original dispute. Officers proactively sought out other witnesses and evidence of the family dispute and were able to develop probable cause to charge the suspect with felony menacing and seize the hand gun involved. Throughout the course on the incident and investigation, officers and sergeants were confronted with two separate and potentially dangerous situations. Due to the diligence, teamwork, and professionalism of all officers involved, two separate felony case filings were charged and two handguns and an substantial amount of narcotics were seized.

**Officer Christopher Neiman and Officer Todd Alscher**

On May 14th, 2016, dispatch aired a call of a family dispute with a party armed with a gun. Information aired that Jeramiah Brown had pointed a gun at the RP and was making delusional and paranoid statements. It was reported that Brown is going through a divorce and has recently started smoking meth again. The RP also reported that he had additional guns in the basement but did not know what types they were. While en route to the call, Officer Alscher took charge and made excellent command decisions in reference to needed information. Several officers arrived on scene and developed a secure perimeter around the house. Officer Alscher was then directed to attempt phone contact with Brown. Contact was made and Officer Alscher talked with Brown for several minutes. During that time Brown threatened to kill everyone and made several delusional, paranoid, and hostile comments. Officer Alscher remained calm and professional. Brown finally said he did not trust the Aurora Police Department and said he wanted the Arapahoe County Sheriff’s Office to respond and hung up. Officer Alscher was instructed to have another officer call him back and say he was from Arapahoe County. Officer Neiman then made phone contact representing himself as an Arapahoe County Deputy and convinced Brown that he was on his way and to follow the instructions of the officers on scene. Brown exited the house unarmed and was taken into custody without incident. An AR-15, a sawed-off shotgun, and 2 handguns along with several hundred rounds of ammunition were recovered. Officer Alscher and Neiman were commended for their professionalism and dedication to duty while handling this potentially dangerous armed party.

**Officer Candice Iovine**

On April 23rd, 2016, officers responded to a domestic violence call at 1453 N. Norfolk Street. During the course of the investigation, they determined that there was probable cause to arrest a female. There was a short struggle between the officers and the female as she was being taken into custody. During this incident the female’s seven year old son ran into the kitchen and picked up a 12” kitchen knife and began advancing towards the officers who were taking his mother into custody. He was stopped and the knife was taken away by an officer and another person present on scene. Officer Candice Iovine was reviewing this case as part of her duties as the PAR officer for that area (Area 14). Officer Iovine is involved in the Restoration Fellowship Hoops Park basketball camp which is held in June. She recognized that this might be a good opportunity to connect with the child in a positive way. She called the mother but the mother was initially upset that Officer Iovine was contacting her to talk about her son. When the mother learned that Officer Iovine was offering to help get the child into the basketball camp she was extremely grateful and almost tearful. Officer Iovine did a fantastic job of recognizing an opportunity to help a child who had witnessed his mother’s arrest.
Agent Christopher Barchetti, Officer Ed Brooks, Officer Patricio Serrant, and Officer Thomas Beach
Towards the end of 2015, District 2 showed an increase in reported storage unit burglaries. This information was passed along to District 2 BIG Officers Ed Brooks and Patricio Serrant. They began researching the reports for similarities when they were contacted by District 2 Patrol Officer Thomas Beach in January 2016. Officer Beach relayed that he observed in several of his investigations that there was a common name, Eugene Forbes. He brought this information to Officers Brooks and Serrant who began the tedious task of reviewing all the reports, contacting the storage unit businesses, and linking Forbes to each storage unit where there was a reported burglary. Officer Brooks and Serrant developed an investigative theory on how these burglaries were occurring and developed the changing M.O. of Forbes. Officer Brooks and Serrant began identifying stolen property through Leads Online and contacting each victim of the known storage unit burglary and obtaining descriptions of the stolen property. They were then able to identify the pawned stolen property and where it was at. Their investigation led to a minimum of 24 storage unit burglaries in Districts 2 and 3 which were linked to Forbes and his associates. Detective Barchetti was assigned to oversee this growing investigation. He authored search warrants, arranged for the collection of stolen property, and for the arrest of Forbes. He and Officer Serrant interviewed Forbes who confessed to the majority of the storage unit burglaries and also to unreported burglaries. This investigation demonstrates how teamwork, information sharing, analysis, and good old fashioned police work ended up with multiple criminal counts on Forbes and his associates along with the recovery of thousands of dollars of stolen property.

Officer Virgil Majors
On October 9th, 2016, Officer Virgil Majors proudly represented the Aurora Police Department in a discussion about police-community relations before the group Jack and Jill of American, Inc. The event was hosted by the Aurora Municipal Courts, more specifically Court Administrator Zelda Boyles, Ph.D., and the Honorable Judge Kris Colley. Jack and Jill of America, Inc., is a historically African American group whose aim is to shape the lives of young people by empowering them to become leaders. Dr. Zelda Boyles made this statement about the efforts of Officer Majors, “He did an exceptional job of answering the tough questions with tact, honesty, and compassion. He spoke of the value of giving respect and the benefit of the doubt to members of a profession that have had a long and turbulent relationship with our community. Additionally, he spoke candidly about the hazards of accepting information disseminated by social media as the truth. Officer Majors was an exemplary model of the City’s core values. He had integrity; was respectful and professional; and treated each young person as a valued customer.” In recognition of Officer Majors’ on-going commitment to ensuring a two-way dialogue between the Aurora Police Department and members of the community he was awarded a commander’s commendation.

Sergeant Mike Hanifin and Lieutenant Darin Parker
Sergeant Hanifin was assigned an Officer Involved Shooting that was not the typical OIS and had generated a considerable amount of media interest. Sergeant Hanifin was tasked with conducting a complete and thorough review of the case and not merely a “rubber stamp” of the previous legal process. This was an uncomfortable investigation for all involved. Lieutenant Parker and Sergeant Hanifin worked together on this case and they did an excellent job. Their review of the case and the work they did has strengthened the ethical reputation of the Aurora Police Department.
Officer Steven Spanos and Officer Christopher Sloan
On February 22nd, 2016, at approximately 1851 hours, officers were dispatched to the area of 12507 E. Mississippi Avenue on a report of two suspicious parties. The reporting party observed two males handling a rifle outside of the business. The two males were later observed walking into the Metro PCS store at this location, one of the males holding the rifle at his side. Based on the information provided, responding officers believed this to be a robbery in progress involving a rifle. Responding officers set up on all sides of the building with a perimeter securing it. Additional officers responded to block the exits and entrances and reduce the flow of traffic into the busy shopping center. Efforts were made to evacuate as many of the surrounding businesses as possible. An arrest team was set up outside the business with less-lethal options available. Officer’s on-scene were able to see the males inside the business and clearly distinguish a rifle held at the side of one of the two males. Numerous phone calls were attempted at numbers for the business with no answer inside. The male with the rifle eventually left the business through the front door and orders were given. The male dropped the rifle but attempted to retreat back inside the business despite orders to remain outside. A less-lethal projectile was fired at the male who was not hit. The male complied with orders and was taken into custody. The second male inside the business was ordered out and taken into custody without incident. Investigation later revealed no crime was committed with the rifle which later was determined to be a pellet gun. All of the offices participating in this call were commended for their actions, professionalism, communication and teamwork.

Officer Blake Beasley, Officer Sherrita Bishop, Officer Anthony Camerucci, Officer Chad Elliott, Officer Brett Iske, Officer Ralph Knight, Officer Virgil Majors, Officer Jeffrey Marsich, Officer Adam Roberts
On May 1st, 2016, at approximately 1556 hours District 3 units responded to 22021 E Princeton Circle for what started as a civil complaint with a subject inside the residence destroying things. While responding to the call it was aired that the male subject inside was also wanted on felony warrants and listed as a high risk arrest for being armed in the past. Officer Iske and Officer Beasley arrived in the area first and contacted several occupants from the house. After a few minutes, several other occupants were able to get out of the house and speak with Officer Beasley. It was quickly determined that the subject had barricaded himself inside the upstairs bedroom. He stated he had poured a flammable liquid all over himself and the room. The subject was also believed to be armed with a handgun. Officer Beasley made phone contact with another female who was the only person left inside with the subject. The female stated she could leave the residence, but that could not be confirmed and she was not coming out. Officer A. Roberts and Officer Camerucci set up containment on the rear of the house. Officer Iske, Elliott, Knight, Bishop, and K9 Officer Marsich were set up at the front as an arrest/rescue team. Officer Majors arrived and assisted with containment and also securing the occupants who had got out of the house. The incident went on for several hours. Officer Beasley continued to make phone contact with the suspect and female inside. He did an excellent job keeping calm and speaking with them trying to gather information while SWAT was being called out. Eventually, Officer Beasley was able to talk with the female and get help in convincing the subject to come outside and give up. The subject came out a short time later and was arrested without incident. This was a volatile situation that went on for several hours and all the officers did an excellent job working as a team to come up with a tactical plan and keep the neighborhood safe.
Agent Randy Carroll
On July 20\textsuperscript{th} through September 13\textsuperscript{th} of 2016, a series of aggravated robberies were committed by an unknown suspect at two Albertson's Pharmacies located in Aurora. District 2 Detective Randy Carroll began actively working these cases and viewed surveillance videos, conducted interviews with victims and witnesses alike, prepared a suspect bulletin, and visited numerous Patrol shift briefings in an attempt to crack these cases. Additionally, Agent Carroll worked on having a tracking device strategically placed into a pill bottle so that the robber could be tracked if he were to strike again. On September 13\textsuperscript{th}, 2016 at 1955 hours, the suspect committed his fourth aggravated robbery, and was unknowingly given the tracking device. After a brief standoff outside of his residence, the suspect was safely taken into custody. Agent Carroll later served a warrant on the suspect's residence, where additional evidence was located connecting him to the three previous robberies. Agent Carroll is to be commended for his hard work, perseverance, dedication and attention to detail in implementing steps in order to ensure a successful outcome with these cases. The arrest of a dangerous pattern robber is another prime example and outcome of Agent Carroll's professional work product, and reflects highly upon himself and the Aurora Police Department.

Officer Brian Phipps
On November 6\textsuperscript{th}, 2016, at 1812 hours Officer Brian Phipps and Officer Virgil Majors were dispatched to a welfare check at 17886 E. Caroline Place. Officer Phipps arrived on scene and began a dialogue with the reporting party. Officer Phipps showed tremendous compassion and restraint while dealing with the reporting party. Officer Phipps was able to engage and build a rapport with the citizen when other officers could not. Officer Phipps demonstrated his exceptional ability to show compassion and dedication to the citizens of Aurora.

Sergeant Michael Pitrusu and Officer Stephen Edwards
On June 8\textsuperscript{th}, 2016, the TCF Bank at 16999 E. Quincy Avenue was robbed by a lone gunman of $3,985.00. GPS trackers placed the vehicle traveling westbound on Quincy Avenue. The tracker began pinging in the area of South Parker Road and Peoria Street where Aurora Police SWAT was already conducting tactical training operations. Sergeant Michael Pitrusu and Officer Stephen Edwards along with other members of the SWAT team responded and immediately began searching for the GPS which was concealed in an unknown vehicle, as no suspect had been identified. Sergeant Pitrusu kept a moving perimeter as well as directing officers not to pursue alone behind a King Soopers, when the GPS momentarily went back behind the building. Officer Edwards was observing the area, when a lone civilian vehicle, a black Jeep Wrangler, had turned in a manner consistent with the GPS location. Unable to get a view of the driver, Edwards and Pitrusu followed the vehicle into an underground garage where the driver stopped and exited. Officer Edwards approached the Jeep in a manner later described by an FBI SWAT member on Safe Streets as “tactically perfect”. Edwards then contacted the driver who was wearing business attire and not the clothing described by the bank employees. Edwards, unsure if he had a victim, witness or suspect stopped and searched the male. He escorted the male away while Sergeant Pitrusu conducted a search of the vehicle. As the driver walked away with Officer Edwards, he made a spontaneous statement “you got me”, “I did it”. Edwards arrested the driver who later confessed to two armed bank robberies using a loaded Glock 9mm which was later found with all the clothes worn and the money from the TCF Bank robbery. Because of the outstanding tactical response and written
documentation efforts put forth by both of the officers they were awarded a commander’s commendation.

**Sergeant Michael Douglass**
From July 18, 2016, through November 4, 2016, Sergeant Douglass inherited the responsibility to supervise and manage not only his own team of officers but Team 31 as well. During this four month period during the peak of summer and fall, Sergeant Douglass was often times the only supervisor working and as a result, he used very little leave time and as the only supervisor, he was unable to take leave when necessary to be present for his family. Sergeant Douglass displayed a positive attitude and proficiently navigated the many responsibilities of two supervisors to include: mentorship, leadership, interpersonal communication, briefing responsibilities, report approvals and management, training and vacation scheduling, and crime scene management. Sergeant Michael Douglass is hereby recognized and appreciated for his perseverance, dedication, and professionalism during this period.

**Officer Gergerly Boros, Officer Katie Brugler, Officer Ed Clements, Sergeant James Gleason, Officer Cody Jones, Officer Jose Ortiz, Officer Ashley Rathbun, Officer Christopher Schipke, Dispatcher Kimberly Lewis, Dispatcher Paige McDowell, Dispatcher Jackie Sweeney-Rodriguez, Dispatcher Gabrielle Trollinger**
On November 8th, 2016, between 0255 and 0329 hours, Aurora Public Safety Communications Dispatch received a series of 911 calls reporting armed robberies taking place along the 16000 blocks of E. Colfax Ave and E. 6th Ave. Three separate robberies, occurring approximately 15 minutes apart, were reported by multiple victims giving nearly identical descriptions of a suspect armed with a semi-automatic pistol. As PSCD call takers and Dispatchers obtained and broadcast minute-by-minute updates of the suspects’ actions and movements, APD officers coordinated their efforts to track down and capture this career criminal while he was still actively engaged in his violent crime spree. If not for the officer’s tremendous restraint and professionalism, what could have played out as a deadly-force encounter was resolved without injury. Their efforts resulted in the positive identification of the suspect, the recovery of suspects’ weapon and mask, and the property taken. The actions of all involved exemplify the highest qualities of teamwork, communication skills, tactics, restraint, and performance under stress. In recognition, the Aurora Police Department Commander’s Commendation was awarded to: PSCD CT Paige McDowell, PSCD CT Jackie Sweeney-Rodriguez, PSCD CT Gabrielle Trollinger, PSCD Disptacher Kimberly Lewis, Officer Gregely Boros, Officer Katie Brugler, Officer Edward Clements, Officer Michael Dobbins, Officer Cody Jones, Officer Ashley Orr, Officer Jose Ortiz, and Officer Christopher Schipke.

**Officer Sheritta Bishop**
On November 20th, 2016, at 2316 hours, APD officers responded to the area of E. Iliff Ave and S. Buckley Road reference a just-occurred attempted armed robbery where the victim had been shot. Officers had been in the area approximately an hour earlier on an armed robbery involving two male suspects. Officer Bishop responded to the area and thoughtfully chose a route of travel where the suspects might be located. Officer Bishop did observe suspects matching the description of shooting suspects in the area of E. Asbury and S. Pitkin Street. Officer Bishop followed these suspects to a residence while simultaneously directing in other responding officers. At this address officers located and detained suspects. A field identification was conducted whereupon suspects were positively identified. Due to her ability to follow the suspects and maintain continuous visual surveillance, Officer Bishop was able to direct responding
officers to where evidence of these crimes had been dropped while suspects fled the crime to include a loaded Sig-Sauer handgun.

**Sergeant Tim Holt**
On January 9th, 2016, at 0215 hours a robbery was aired next to AFD Station 1. A victim had sustained injuries as a result of an assault. A suspect vehicle description was aired of a Silver Dodge Neon and at least two handguns were involved. Sgt. Holt observed the suspect vehicle on Colfax, getting on the north bound on-ramp to I-225. He made a stop on the vehicle which pulled over. 4 subjects were in the vehicle and it was confirmed by officers at the scene that Sgt. Holt did in fact have the suspect vehicle. Once the suspects were properly secured, a show up confirmed that 3 of the 4 suspects had been involved in the robbery. Sgt. Holt observed a replica air gun revolver in the vehicle and blood evidence from the assault on the exterior of the vehicle. Due to his being alert to the suspect vehicle description, even though being far from the crime scene, three suspects were arrested and evidence of their crime secured.

**Officer Patrick Benda, Officer Nicholas Brungardt, Officer Joseph Duran, Officer Bridget Johnson, Officer Alfred Stenersen, Officer Jacob Tubbs, Sergeant Jake Stull, Sergeant Gregg Gallozzi**
On November 17th, 2016, at approximately 0356 hours, officers responded to 18155 E Ohio Ave #102 on a call of a suicidal party who had locked himself in the bathroom with a knife and was also making threats that he was going to try to electrocute himself by dropping a plugged in curling iron into a bath tub was filled with water while he was lying in it. The party, identified as Miles Everett, did not live at the apartment. Upon arrival, Officers Benda and Tubbs immediately contacted the home owner, Starr Cornish, who advised that Everett was in the bathroom and that he has never lived in the apartment even though he is the father of her children. Cornish stated that when Everett came to the door, he had stuck a semi-automatic hand gun in his mouth and demanded to see the kids. Cornish stated that Everett was under the influence of alcohol. Sergeant Greg Gallozzi responded with straps to use to tie off the door to try to ensure that officers would not be injured. These straps proved to be an integral part of the call that allowed officers to maintain control of the call. Officer Tubbs and Stenersen were tasked with ensuring that the strap stayed in place so that we could control the ingress/egress into the bathroom. Officers Joe Duran and Pat Benda did an excellent job establishing communication with Everett who was initially very hostile with police, shouting his distrust of police as well as other profanities, and were able to keep Everett talking which eventually de-escalated the contact and led to a peaceful conclusion for this call. Officers Benda and Duran were an essential element in allowing Everett to vent and build trust that APD personnel. Officer Brungardt was tasked with collecting statements and consent to search forms from Cornish and seizing the fire arm that Everett had when he responded to the apartment. Officer B. Johnson was tasked with getting more resources to the scene in case the situation escalated. Everett was taken into custody without further incident for the following charges: Possession of Weapon by a Previous Offender, 1st Degree Criminal Trespass, and Criminal Mischief. All officers on this call worked together as a cohesive unit in order to gain this peaceful resolution to this two hour standoff with an armed and barricaded suicidal party. The professionalism and patience that were demonstrated by all officers involved was a true demonstration of the superior training and professionalism of the Aurora Police Department.
Automated Complaint and Commendation Report

The Automated Complaint and Commendation System accepts and records all submissions. The Department designed the system to manage the complaints and commendations reported on sworn personnel.

During 2016, there were 471 complaints received online or entered by a Police Department member that involved 467 sworn members and four non-sworn members.

Additionally, 55 commendations were received for sworn officers. There were zero commendations submitted for non-sworn members of the Department.

2016 Automated Complaints and Commendations
Automated Complaints by Type

The Automated Complaint System categorizes the submissions for the Department to analyze, determine trends and provide instruction if needed.

The system categorizes the complaints received during 2016, as follows: Four alleging an illegal search. Zero reported neglect of duty, 55 reported violations of court issues or missed court, two reported violations of Constitutional rights, three allegations of unsatisfactory performance, seventeen allegations of racial profiling, 23 reports of excessive use of force, 41 complaints of improper or incomplete investigations, 91 for other directives or SOPs not captured under the other types and 105 complaints of rudeness or professionalism issues.

Complaints by Event Type

- Illegal Search (4)
- Neglect of Duty (0)
- Constitutional Requirements (2)
- Unsatisfactory Performance (3)
- Bias-based Profiling (17)
- Use of Force (23)
- Improper/Incomplete Investigation (41)
- Other Dept. Directive or SOP (91)
- Officer Professionalism (105)
- Court Issue (55)
Automated Complaints by Validity

In each of the complaint submissions received, the officer’s supervisor has investigated the complaint. The officer’s chain of command has reviewed the investigations before closing them.

The Department has reviewed each of the complaints and analyzed the validity of the complaint. From these 94 were sustained, 49 not sustained, 169 unfounded, 99 within policy, five misunderstandings, and 46 unknown due to unresponsive complainants.

Complaints by Validity

- Sustained (94)
- Not Sustained (49)
- Unfounded (169)
- Policy Compliance (99)
- Misunderstanding (5)
- Unknown Validity (46)
Automated Complaints, Results

The Automated Complaint System records any corrective action taken by the Department as a result of the investigation. The results range from “none justified” to an order by the Chief to the Internal Affairs Section to formally investigate the complaint. Careful study and comparison of this information will reveal that more incidents result in some form of correction than incidents that are found to be valid. This is because the complaint may not be valid in light of the Department Directives, but the supervisor may determine the officer needs some degree of instruction to help him/her do a better job.

The results of the complaints submitted are as follows in descending order of severity. The Chief of Police ordered the Internal Affairs Section to formally investigate 71 members. The Department issued 10 Written Reprimands for violations of Department Directives. A Written Reprimand is permanent discipline that may remain in the officer’s file for his/her entire career. The Department issued seven Corrective Action Reports instructing the officers to change their behavior. The Corrective Action Report is not discipline but a notice or warning to modify behavior. The Corrective Action Report remains in the officer’s file for one to two years, depending on his/her evaluation date and cycle. It is documentation of past concerns, measures taken to correct behavior, and potential consequences if the officer repeats the behavior. Supervisors issued 40 Performance Appraisal Entry (PAE) reports documenting negative performance. The supervisors use the PAE reports as documentation and are included in the officers’ annual evaluations. On 30 occasions the supervisors verbally counseled the officers. Thirteen complaints were referred to mediation. The supervisors completed three Performance Appraisal Entry reports that were to document the investigation only (nothing negative toward the officer). The Department concluded in 296 of the complaints that the complaint was not valid and that no documentation was needed.

Automated Compliants - Results

- Referred to IAS (71)
- Written Reprimand (10)
- Corrective Action Report (7)
- PAE for Correction (40)
- PAE Documentation (3)
- No Documentation Needed (296)
- Mediation (13)
- Counseling Only (30)
Automated Complaints, Follow Up Contact Method

At the conclusion of the investigation the supervisor is required, if possible, to contact the complainant and explain the findings. The Automated Complaint System records show the supervisor contacted that person.

The supervisors contacted the complainant by telephone in 169 of the cases. The supervisors used e-mail 24 times. In 18 cases, the supervisor could not contact the complainant (anonymous complaint or attempted but unable to contact). The supervisor met the complainant in person 123 times.
Automated Commendations by Type

The system categorized the 55 commendations received during 2016 as follows:

20 citizen submissions expressed appreciation for the officer. One other reported a job well done. Nine submissions stated the officer was professional. Four reported the officer went above and beyond expectations and 21 expressed a thank you.
Automated Complaint and Commendation System,
Miscellaneous Information on People Reporting

The automated complaint and commendation system allows the submitting person the opportunity to provide information about himself/herself. The system has a drop-down menu giving the person a choice of options to describe himself/herself. 122 of the people submitting a complaint or commendation indicated they were a citizen of Aurora. 42 indicated they were a non-resident. 60 said they were an employee member of the Department, and 54 indicated they were a government official.
Gender of People Submitting Commendations and Complaints

- Male (160) - 55%
- Female (116) - 40%
- Unknown Gender (16) - 5%

Reported Ethnicity of People Submitting Commendations and Complaints

- White (116) - 40%
- African American (42) - 40%
- Latino (13) - 15%
- Asian (2) - >1%
- American Indian (0) - >1%
- Arab (0) - 1%
- Unknown (116) - 4%
District and Bureau Discipline Report

During 2016, the Department completed and finalized 17 District / Bureau investigations. Each resulted in the Chief of Police ordering a Written Reprimand as discipline for the violation of one or more Department Directives. A Written Reprimand is permanent discipline that remain in the employee’s file for his/her career. The following is a summary of these cases for 2016.

Chief Metz and the Aurora Police Department recognize members of the Aurora Police Department have a right to privacy in the contents of their personnel files and expect the contents of these files will be held in confidence by their employer. This expectation and right to privacy flows from the United States Constitution, the Colorado Constitution, the Colorado Open Records Act, Colorado Revised Statutes § 24-72-201, et. seq., the Colorado Criminal Justice Records Act, Colorado Revised Statutes, § 24-72-301, et. seq., the City of Aurora Personnel Policies and Procedures, and the Aurora Police Department Directives. While there is little, if any, public interest in investigations stemming from allegations relating to purely administrative matters such as the use of equipment, abuse of leave and the like, these matters are nonetheless provided below.

Further, the City of Aurora also maintains the right to withhold its deliberative process as confidential. The following summaries are included with these privileges of confidentiality in mind. The following summaries do not constitute a waiver of either the individual employee’s expectation of privacy in the contents of his/her personnel file, nor waiver of the City of Aurora’s right to withhold its deliberative process as confidential.

The Department has categorized these 17 cases as follows: Two cases involved members not following Department policies for vehicle operations and/or the Department’s emergency response policy. One case involved issues of professional conduct. One case involved department equipment. Three case involved the handling of evidence and/or property. Two cases involved lawful orders or obedience to orders. Two involved court issues. One case involved neglect of duty. Three cases involved unsatisfactory performance. Two cases involved unintentional discharge of a less lethal weapon.

The 17 District/Bureau written reprimands involved 17 members and were issued to 14 officers, one lieutenant, and two sergeants.

These matters that resulted in written reprimands are summarized with more detail below.

1) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.1 Obedience to Orders, Directives, and Laws.

   This member violated an order given by the Chief of Police regarding communication with another city employee.

2) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.6.5 Use of Departmental Equipment.

   This Officer ended his patrol shift and realized he was no longer in possession of his wallet which contained his department issued identification card.
3) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.9.2 Responsibility for Handling or Depositing Evidence and Other Property.

The Officer conducted a traffic stop which resulted in an arrest of the driver of the vehicle. The Officer also issued a summons to the passenger for possession of drug paraphernalia (a syringe). During transport to the jail for the driver, the Officer heard something fall off the roof of his patrol vehicle but he did not stop to investigate. The Officer later learned that the syringe from the passenger and the arrestee’s cell phone which he had placed on the roof his patrol vehicle, had fallen off his car during transport. The Officer returned to the scene and located the phone but not the syringe.

4) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3.5 Neglect of Duty and 14.3.2.

5) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.3.4 Missed Duty Assignment - Court.

The Officer missed a scheduled DOR hearing. This was the Officer’s third violation.

6) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.9.2 Responsibility for Handling or Depositing Evidence and Other Property.

This Officer made an arrest on a DUI and placed the arrestee’s cell phone on the back of his patrol car and forgot to retrieve it before transporting the arrestee to Detox. The cell phone was never found.

7) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.9.2 Responsibility for Handling or Depositing Evidence and Other Property.

This Officer arrested a driver for a traffic violation. The Officer had placed the arrestee’s cell phone and the wallet on the hood of his patrol vehicle and failed to retrieve it before transport. The cell phone was located later in the middle of the road however the wallet was never located.

8) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.1.1 Lawful Order.

An APA email was sent out to FOP members regarding invoicing members for current and past balances for the APA’s fair share portion for contract negotiations. This member was the only FOP board member available and received an overwhelming amount of calls, texts, and emails from angry FOP members. This member contacted a division chief requesting to respond to the email from the APA and was directed to send a generic message asking members to check their private email accounts. This member instead sent a department wide email against what he had been directed to do.


Member failed to monitor a sergeant’s Telestaff and allowed for the sergeant to accrue overtime and compensatory time on their days off.
10) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance.

While at the training academy this member failed numerous tests.

11) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 8.10.4 Supplemental Reports, 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance, and 16.4.3 Body-Worn Camera Operation.

While working a regular patrol shift as a single officer unit, this member conducted follow-up on a shooting case after being contacted by a subject on the shooting. This Officer made the decision to meet the subject without a cover officer and transported the subject for an interview. The Officer never activated his body-worn camera during the interaction or interview. The officer transported the subject back to the original meeting location and ended his shift that day and then went on vacation for several days without writing a supplemental report until he returned to work.

12) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 5.8.15 Unintentional/Negligent Discharge of a Less Lethal Weapon.

This officer unintentionally discharge his department issued Taser in the men’s locker room of District 3.

13) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.1.3 Vehicle Operation.

Member was at the fuel pumps at the central shops. As he started to drive away he turned around to check that his back door wasn’t opened and collided with the yellow painted barriers.

14) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.3.4 Members Appearing Late or Failure to Appear.

This Officer failed to appear for municipal court for the second time in a year.

15) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.2 Emergency Response and Vehicle Pursuits, 4.2.2 Adherence to Law during Emergency Response, and 4.2.3 Requirements and Restrictions of Emergency Responses.

Upon seeing a vehicle operating without headlamps, this Officer activated his lights and siren and proceeded through an intersection on a red signal light. The Officer entered so quickly that he did not observe a vehicle traveling westbound or give the westbound driver sufficient time to yield right of way thus causing a collision with your unmarked patrol vehicle. This was a preventable accident.

16) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 5.8.15 Unintentional/Negligent Discharge of a Less Lethal Weapon.

This officer unintentionally discharge his department issued Taser in the men’s locker room of District 3.
17) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3 **Professional Conduct and Responsibility.**
Formal Internal Investigations and Discipline Report

During 2016, the Department completed and finalized 46 formal internal investigations. The following is a summary of the cases resolved in 2016.

Chief Metz and the Aurora Police Department recognize the individual members of the Aurora Police Department have a right to privacy in the contents of their personnel files, including the results of formal investigations and incidents of discipline, and expect the contents of these files will be held in confidence by their employer. This expectation and right to privacy flows from the United States Constitution, the Colorado Constitution, the Colorado Open Records Act, Colorado Revised Statute, § 24-72-201, et. Seq., the Colorado Criminal Justice Records Act, Colorado Revised Statutes § 24-72-301. et. Seq., the City of Aurora Personnel Policies and Procedures, and the Aurora Police Department Directives.

Further, the City of Aurora also maintains the right to withhold its deliberative process as confidential. The following summaries are included below with these privileges of confidentiality in mind. The inclusion of the following summaries does not constitute a waiver of either the individual employee’s expectation of privacy in the contents of his/her personnel files, nor waiver of the City of Aurora’s right to withhold its deliberative process as confidential. In an effort to balance the privacy and confidentiality rights of the individual officers, retaining the deliberative process privilege associated with the decision making detailed below, while at the same time providing our citizens with sufficient information to evaluate the adequacy, thoroughness and impartiality of the Aurora Police Department’s internal investigation and disciplinary process, the following information is provided:

Summary

The Department conducted and resolved 46 formal Internal Affairs investigations in 2016 involving 71 department members. These members consisted of two civilians, 56 officers, nine sergeants, two lieutenants, and two captains. The discipline included 18 suspensions without pay, 11 written reprimands, and three corrective actions. Five members resigned or retired before discipline was issued. The Department cleared 32 members of any wrongdoing; either by findings of compliance, exoneration, or they were not sustained.

1) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directives 8.3 Court, 14.1.7 Conduct Involving Moral Turpitude, 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance, 14.3.3 Making a False or Untruthful Declaration, APM Policy 4-1 Employee Conduct, and APM Policy 4-2 Disciplinary Action. The member was not sustained on any directive or policy violations.

   The member was arrested for a DUI in 2012 and had his driver’s license revoked. Following his arrest, he worked various positions with APD that did not require that he have a license. In 2014, this member was re-assigned to patrol and questions arose about his performance. A decision was made to send the member through an FTO program again where he demonstrated several deficiencies in his performance.

2) The Department investigated a sworn member involved in a shooting. This is standard practice in any officer-involved shooting. Directives reviewed for compliance were Directives 5.1.2
Authorized Use of Deadly or Potentially Deadly Force, 5.1.6 Shooting at or from a Moving Vehicle, 5.5.15 Ammunition, 5.5.16 Weapon Inspection and Registration, 7.3.2 Firearms Qualification, 7.3.4 Semi-Automatic Weapons Training, 14.5.8 Critical Incident Drug/Alcohol Testing, and 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance. The member was sustained on department directives 5.1.2, 5.1.6, and 14.3.1. The member received a 180-hour suspension.

Following a traffic stop in Aurora where the suspect fled, several members of APD to include this member followed the suspect into Denver. Once the vehicle came to a stop in Denver, this member exited his vehicle and approached the suspect vehicle on foot. He stood at the driver’s window and banged on the window giving the driver/suspect commands to exit the vehicle. The driver of the vehicle drove forward and fearing for his life the officer fired shots at the vehicle as it drove away.

3) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directives 8.10.3 General Offense Reports, 14.1.1 Lawful Orders, 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance, 14.3.2 Conduct towards Superior and Subordinate Officers and Associates, 14.3.3 Making a False or Untruthful Declaration, and 17.5.4 Police Radio Procedures. The member was sustained on 14.3.1, 14.3.2, and 17.5.4 and received a written reprimand.

This member took a call for service which had been pending in the queue for approximately 1 ½ hours. This member and a sergeant had an exchange about the call over a TAC channel and the officers comments were said to be disrespectful towards the sergeant. A report was submitted by the member into MRE but was later rejected and sent back for corrections. The report was said to be unprofessional in nature and contained opinions by the officer.

4) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.1.6 Conformance to Directives, 14.1.7 Conduct Involving Moral Turpitude, and 14.3.5 Neglect of Duty. The member resigned prior to any discipline.

While assigned to D3 patrol as a supervisor on day shift, this member was identified as not being available for calls for service. An initial inquiry was conducted without the member’s knowledge which was subsequently sent to IAB for further investigation. While looking into the matter, the member found out about the possible investigation being conducted and spoke with his lieutenant about his performance. The member then suddenly put in his paperwork resigning from the department.

5) The Department investigated sworn members involved in a shooting. This is standard practice in any officer-involved shooting. Directives reviewed for compliance were 4.2.8 Authorized Use of Police Pursuits, 4.2.9 Pursuit Guidelines, 5.1.2 Authorized Use of Deadly or Potentially Deadly Force, 5.5.15 Ammunition, 5.5.16 Weapon Inspection and Registration, 7.3.2 Firearms Qualification, 14.5.8 Critical Incident Drug/Alcohol Testing. All members were found in compliance.

Following a robbery at a store in north Aurora, officers responded to the area and located a sedan possibly involved. Officers attempted a traffic stop but the driver fled. Once the pursuit ended, all three officers gave orders to the occupants of the sedan. The passenger of the vehicle jumped out of the window of the vehicle and was holding a gun in his hand. As he climbed over a fence to flee, he turned toward the officers and raised his gun in their direction. All three officers fired their weapons at the passenger.
6) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.1.5 Conformance to Law and 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility. The member received a 160-hour suspension.

This officer was arrested by an outside agency.

7) The Department investigated sworn members involved in a shooting. This is standard practice in any officer-involved shooting. Directives reviewed for compliance were 5.1.2 Authorized Use of Deadly or Potentially Deadly Force, 5.5.15 Ammunition, 5.5.16 Weapon Inspection and Registration, 7.3.2 Firearms Qualification, 14.5.8 Critical Incident Drug/Alcohol Testing. All members were found in compliance.

An officer located a stolen vehicle, which had eluded officers on several occasions, in the parking lot of a 7-11 in north Aurora. Several officers responded to the area and entered the parking lot positioning their patrol cars around the vehicle. The driver of the vehicle began violently maneuvering his vehicle back and forth several times hitting a patrol vehicle behind him and the front of 7-11. The driver then put his vehicle in reverse toward one of the officers who was on foot behind the suspect vehicle. Two officers opened fire on the suspect who was struck six times and died from his wounds.

8) The Department investigated a sworn member involved in a shooting. This is standard practice in any officer-involved shooting. Directives reviewed for compliance were 5.1.2 Authorized Use of Deadly or Potentially Deadly Force, 5.5.15 Ammunition, 5.5.16 Weapon Inspection and Registration, 7.3.2 Firearms Qualification, 14.5.8 Critical Incident Drug/Alcohol Testing. The member was found to be in compliance with all directives.

Member responded to a report of a male party repeatedly stabbing a female victim in the street. He shot the party in order to stop the suspect from stabbing the victim.

9) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 5.8.15 Unintentional Discharge of a Less Lethal Weapon. The member received a 10-hour suspension.

During the course of an investigation, this member unintentionally discharged one bean bag round from the less lethal shotgun.

10) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.1.1 Lawful Order. The member was not sustained.

It was alleged that this member discussed an active IAB investigation with another member who was also witness on the case.

11) The Department investigated a sworn member involved in a shooting. This is standard practice in any officer-involved shooting. Directive reviewed was 5.1.7 Unauthorized Firing of a Weapon Situations. The member was sustained and received a 20-hour suspension.

Member was attempting to apprehend a motor vehicle suspect. He had his gun in his hand and he stumbled in the snow and unintentionally fired his weapon, striking the suspect in the abdomen.
12) The Department investigated sworn members involved in a shooting. This is standard practice in
any officer-involved shooting. Directives reviewed for compliance were 4.2 Emergency Response
and Police Vehicle Pursuits, 5.1.2 Authorized Use of Deadly or Potentially Deadly Force, 5.1.6
Shooting at or from a Moving Vehicle, 5.5.15 Ammunition, 5.5.16 Weapon Inspection and
Registration, 7.3.2 Firearms Qualification, 14.5.8 Critical Incident Drug/Alcohol Testing. All
members were found in compliance.

An officer contacted a disabled vehicle on the off ramp of I225 and when he was returning to his
marked patrol car to arrange for a tow, one of the occupants of the disabled vehicle approached
the officer from behind and struck him in the head with a large knife. The suspect then got in the
officer’s marked patrol car and attempted to run the officer over. The officer fired multiple rounds
from his handgun before the suspect fled in the patrol vehicle. The injured officer gave several
brief radio transmissions altering other officers of the situation. Another officer and a sergeant
quickly located the stolen police vehicle and used a PIT maneuver to forcibly stop the vehicle. The
suspect jumped out of the patrol car and pointed what was believed to be a handgun towards the
officer and sergeant who then opened fire on the suspect who later died at the scene.

13) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.1.7
Conduct Involving Moral Turpitude, 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility, and 14.3.3
Making a False or Untruthful Declaration. The member was sustained on 14.3 and received a
written reprimand.

While in uniform, on-duty, and driving a marked patrol car, member was involved in a verbal
altercation with another officer and a court clerk.

14) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.3.2 Conduct
towards Superior and Subordinate Officers and Associates. The member received a 20-hour
suspension.

During briefing, this officer pulled a chair out from underneath another officer who fell and struck
her head which resulted in a concussion.

15) The Department sustained a civilian member for violating Department Directive 4.3.2 Conduct
towards Superior and Subordinate Officers and Associates. The member retired from the
department before discipline was imposed.

While at the scene of a bank robbery, member had a poor attitude and made inappropriate
comments to members of the Safe Streets Task Force.

16) The Department investigated sworn members for violating Department Directives 14.2.9
Constitutional Requirements and 5.3.1 Use of Physical Force. Members were not sustained.

Members responded to a residence on a welfare check and requested to search the residence.
After consent was given the officers began to search the house and one civilian in the house
became upset and asked the officers to leave. The civilian was placed in handcuffs and moved to
the kitchen before eventually being transported for violating a protection order.

17) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3 Professional
Conduct and Responsibility. Member received a 20-hour suspension.
Member kicked a security door while at court causing minor damage to it.

18) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.9.2 Responsibility for Handling or Depositing Evidence and Other Property. Member received a written reprimand.

Member took a male party into custody and misplaced his wallet which contained an estimated sum of $740.00. Member believed the wallet may have been placed on top of the patrol car and it got lost when she drove away.

19) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.1.7 Conduct Involving Moral Turpitude. Member received a 40-hour suspension.

Member signed in another member for training who was not actually in attendance for the course.

20) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.1.3 Vehicle Operation. Member received a 30-hour suspension.

Member was travelling on Smoky Hill Road when a signal light turned red prior to him entering the intersection which triggered the photo red light camera. This was the member’s fourth red signal violation in two years.

21) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance and APM 3-27 Employee Medical Leave. Member received a written reprimand.

This officer was on injury leave for longer than the allotted timeframe.

22) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 5.1.1 Firearms Safety Rules and 5.1.3 Other Unauthorized Firing of a Weapon. Member received a 40-hour suspension.

This member hung his duty weapon from the clothes hook in the restroom and a round was unintentionally discharged causing damage to the ceiling.

23) The Department sustained sworn members for violating Department Directives 5.4.2 Incidents that Require Notification and Reporting, 5.3.1 Use of Force, and 14.2.9 Constitutional Requirements. One member received a written reprimand and one member received a 20-hour suspension.

This officer responded to a civil dispute where he attempted to remove a box cutter from one of the parties involved and when the party refused, the officer conducted a takedown of her. The supervisor on scene failed to report the use of force.

24) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.1.1 Lawful Orders. The member retired prior to discipline.

This member violated one or more of the mandated stipulations placed upon her pertaining to her on-going fitness for duty examination.
25) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.9.3 Depositing Evidence and Other Property. Member received a 10-hour suspension.

This officer responded to a call for service where a citizen found a drone in her backyard. The officer took possession of the drone, which was damaged, and put it in the trash compactor instead of into property.

26) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 6.11.2 Responsibility for Preliminary Investigations, 8.9.3 Depositing Evidence and Other Property, 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance, and 6.6.9 Detainee's Property. Member resigned prior to discipline.

This officer took a female shoplifter into custody where he located several hypodermic needles on her person. The officer disposed of the needles in the trash can at the jail and refused to assist detention officers with a strip search.

27) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 6.11.13 Collection, Preservation, and Use of Physical Evidence, 8.9.3 Depositing Evidence and Other Property, 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance, and 14.3.3 Making a False or Untruthful Declaration. Member retired prior to discipline.

This officer submitted late reports for approval, improperly collected, stored, and processed criminal evidence and personal property, did not maintain proper chain of custody for criminal evidence, and incorrectly stated information in official police reports.

28) The Department investigated sworn members for violating Department Directives 7.3.2 Firearms Qualification, 8.1.6 Uniform and Equipment Regulation, 8.2.5 Records Management Reconciliation, 14.1.7 Conduct Involving Moral Turpitude, 14.3.5 Neglect of Duty, and 14.5.4 Alcohol Impairment. One member was sustained on 8.2.5 and received a corrective action. All other members were not sustained or the allegations were unfounded.

These officers and a sergeant were investigated for several allegations directed at how the unit was being ran.

29) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance and 14.3.3 Making a False or Untruthful Declaration. Member was sustained on 14.3.1 and received a 40-hour suspension.

This member made statements to his supervisor implying he had attended a personnel meeting with a subordinate which he did not attend.

30) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 8.9.3 Depositing Evidence and Other and 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance. Member received a 10-hour suspension.

This officer failed to properly log evidence into the Property and Evidence unit.

31) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.6.2 Issuing and Maintenance of Portable Radios. Member received a written reprimand.
This officer lost his portable radio after attending training at the academy.

32) The Department investigated sworn members for violating Department Directives 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility, 14.3.8 Police-Community Relations, and 17.2.2 Unauthorized Use of CAD and MDC Systems. Both members were sustained on 14.3 and 17.2.2. Both members received a written reprimand.

These members made inappropriate comments over the MDC.

33) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 6.11.2 Responsibility for Preliminary Investigations, and 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance. Member resigned prior to discipline.

This officer failed to complete a sufficient preliminary investigation.

34) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 6.6.9 Detainee’s Property. The member received a corrective action.

This officer failed to place prescription pills from a prisoner into police property.

35) The Department investigated sworn members for violating Department Directives 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance, and 14.3.8 Police-Community Relations. Both members were sustained on 14.3.8 and received a 10-hour suspension.

These members interacted with staff at Arapahoe House during an attempt to locate a missing person and misunderstood laws pertaining to patient confidentiality and were rude to the staff and created a disruptive environment for the patients.

36) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.5.2 Controlled Substances. The member received a corrective action.

This member ingested two prescribed controlled substances while on duty and had not completed a Prescribed Controlled Substance Notification Checklist.

37) The Department investigated sworn members for violating Department Directive 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility. The members were not sustained.

These members were seen in uniform at a local restaurant with their significant others and it was alleged that they were acting inappropriately throughout the course of their meal.

38) The Department investigated sworn members for violating Department Directives 4.2.8 Authorized Use of Police Pursuits, 4.2.9 Pursuit Guidelines, and 14.1.1 Lawful Orders. The members were not sustained.

Officers engaged in a police pursuit without justification and failed to obey a lawful order given by a supervisory officer.

39) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 5.8.15 Unintentional/Negligent Discharge of a Less Lethal Weapon. The member received a 10-hour suspension.
This officer unintentionally discharged a round from the less lethal shotgun.

40) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directives 5.3.1 **Use of Physical Force**, 5.8.7 **O.C. Spray**, and 14.2.9 **Constitutional Requirements**. The member was not sustained.

This officer allegedly unlawfully detained a subject and used physical force as well as deployed OC spray to arrest the subject.

41) The Department investigated sworn members for violating Department Directives 5.3 **Use of Force**, 14.2.9 **Constitutional Requirements**, and 14.3.8 **Police-Community Relations**. Both members were sustained on 14.3.8 and received written reprimands.

Both officers were discourteous in their contact with a subject and physical force was used to take the subject into custody.

42) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directives 6.11.2 **Responsibility for Preliminary Investigations**, 6.11.13 **Collection, Preservation, and Use of Physical Evidence**, and 14.3.3 **Making a False or Untruthful Declaration**. The member was sustained on 6.11.2 and 6.11.13 and received a 20-hour suspension.

This officer investigated a fight between two students at a high school. During the investigation, he became aware of a video recording of the fight but the video was never collected.

43) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.2.9 **Constitutional Requirements**. The member received a 40-hour suspension.

This officer unlawfully seized and transported a citizen to the jail without probable cause for a custodial arrest.

44) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.1.1 **Lawful Orders** and 14.3.3 **Making a False or Untruthful Declaration**. The member retired prior to discipline.

This member had a urine analysis test which resulted in a positive result for ethyl alcohol.

45) The Department investigated a civilian member for violating Department Directives 14.1.1 **Lawful Orders** and 14.3.1 **Unsatisfactory Performance**. The member was sustained on 14.1.1 and received a written reprimand.

This member failed to obey a lawful order given by her supervisor.

46) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3.1 **Unsatisfactory Performance**. The member was not sustained.

This officer did not maintain sufficient competency to properly perform his assigned responsibilities.
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Introduction

In conjunction with our core values of integrity, honor and duty, the Aurora Police Department strives for professionalism in the performance of our duties. We encourage positive behavior in our employees by the use of awards and commendations. We also encourage our employees and citizens to report any perceived misconduct by our officers. We investigate every complaint and concern reported to the Department and take appropriate action, protecting the rights of the citizen and the Department member. This report reflects our commitment to openness and transparency to the community we serve.

The Department has two systems to award outstanding performance and three systems to manage complaints and discipline. The two award systems are Formal Department Awards and Informal Commander’s Commendations. The three systems used to manage complaints and disciplines are: the Automated Complaint and Commendation System; District / Bureau Discipline; and Formal Internal Investigations and Discipline.

Formal Department Awards

All employees of the Department who become aware of outstanding performance are encouraged to nominate employees and citizens for recognition through the Formal Department Awards program. Department Directive 10.7 describes the guidelines for these awards. See the Directive at the end of this report under the “Department Directives Cited in this Report” section. The Awards Board reviews and investigates all nominations for formal awards and then makes a recommendation to the Chief of Police. The Chief of Police makes the final decision on the appropriateness of each award. Awards available under the Formal Department Awards program are: Medal of Honor; Distinguished Service Cross; Purple Heart; Life Saving Award; Meritorious Service Ribbon; Chief’s Commendation Certificate; Chief’s Unit Citation; Community Commitment Certificate; and the Certificate of Appreciation – Citizen’s Award. These awards are described in the Formal Department Awards section of this report.

Automated Complaint and Commendation System

The Aurora Police Department created the Automated Complaint and Commendation System in 2006 to manage and record all allegations and investigations of complaints and commendations received on sworn officers of the Department. Regardless of how received, all complaints and commendations are entered into the automated system.

Citizens can enter their complaint or commendation directly online through the City’s website. If the Department receives a complaint or commendation in person, on the telephone or in writing, the receiving employee enters the information into the system. Once entered in the automated system, the complaint is forwarded to the Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB) Commanding Officer. Once the Internal Affairs Commanding Officer or designee has reviewed the case, if he or she determines the case in an allegation that can be investigated at the Bureau/District level, he or she will send the case to the appropriate Commanding Officer. The Commanding Officer will assign the case to an appropriate supervisor in the Bureau/District and a preliminary investigation will be completed. If during the preliminary investigation, the investigator believes the allegation should not be handled at the Bureau/District level, a request for investigation by the IAB will be completed and forwarded, through the complaint management system to the subject member’s Division Chief.
Safeguards built into the system include the following: no one can delete the complaint or commendation; only one supervisor can work on the complaint at a time (following the chain of command); supervisors can add information but cannot remove it; all information inserted into the system is saved, documenting the date and time submitted and by whom; supervisors can search the system to determine if the officer has similar complaints and or commendations.

The system records all of the information and produces statistical information. Police managers use the information to determine future training needs as well as to decide an appropriate level of discipline.

**District and Bureau Discipline**

The most severe result of incidents reported in this section are Written Reprimands, which are the lowest level of formal discipline. The Internal Affairs Bureau investigates cases that may require discipline greater than a Written Reprimand. Cases that result in corrective measures (training verses discipline) are recorded in the Automated Complaint and Commendation System. A Police Department Supervisor or Manager investigates all District / Bureau Discipline cases. He/she obtains all of the necessary information and reports his/her findings to his/her supervisor. The employee’s chain of command reviews the investigation. If any supervisor in the chain of command determines that the employee violated a Department Directive(s) and decides the appropriate level of discipline is a Written Reprimand, he/she makes that recommendation to the Chief of Police or his designee. If the Chief concurs with the findings, a Written Reprimand is prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Chief. The Chief of Police may personally issue and serve the Written Reprimand on the employee or delegate this duty to a command officer within the employee’s chain of command. The Written Reprimand is part of the employee’s permanent discipline file.

**Formal Internal Investigations and Discipline**

The Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB) Commanding Officer or designee receives allegations of misconduct. The IAB Commanding Officer determines whether the allegation of misconduct necessitates an IAB investigation. The IAB has the authority of the Chief of Police to conduct investigations. Additionally, critical incidents (i.e. police shootings, use of force resulting in serious injuries or death, serious traffic accidents involving officers, etc.) may result in a formal investigation regardless of whether there is any evidence or accusation of misconduct. The IAB completes the investigation and will notify the subject member/members’ Division Chief(s), and Bureau/District Commander Officer(s) that the case is available for review. Once the involved Chiefs and Commanding Officers have read the case, the Deputy Chief, on behalf of the Chief of Police, will convene a Chief’s Review Board (CRB). The CRB will review the case and discuss the recommendation of finding from the IAB Commander. If the CRB determines a finding of sustained for any allegation of misconduct, or noncompliance for any compliance review, the CRB will make a recommendation of discipline to the Chief of Police. The Chief of Police will inform the member of recommended discipline.
Perspective Statistics
The Department provides the following statistical information for the purpose of perspective. The Department currently employs 696 sworn officers and 142 civilian employees (total 838). During 2017, the Department handled 233,559 calls for service from the public, arrested 9,713 suspects, issued 6,769 criminal summonses (non-custodial arrests) and issued 26,440 traffic citations (this excludes parking tickets and General Offense related traffic summonses).

Formal Department Awards
During 2017, the Aurora Police Department presented 199 awards through the formal program. The Department presented one Medal of Honor award. The Department honored 21 officers with the Distinguished Service Cross. The Department did not present a Purple Heart Award. The Department presented ten officers with the Life Saving Award. The Department recognized 42 officers, civilians, and outside agency members with the Meritorious Service Ribbon. The Chief commended 101 officers and civilians with Chief’s Commendation Certificates. The Chief presented five Chief’s Unit Citations. The Department presented three citizens with the Certificate of Appreciation - Citizens Award. The Department presented one Community Commitment Certificate. The Department presented six Excellence Awards. The Department presented six Innovation Awards. The Department presented three Superior Awards.
Medal of Honor

The Medal of Honor may be awarded by the Chief of Police to members who distinguish themselves by intentionally and knowingly placing themselves in a situation that involves an actual and imminent danger of death and whose actions demonstrate conspicuous bravery or heroism significantly above and beyond the call of duty. The member must perform an act so outstanding that it clearly demonstrates extraordinary courage beyond the requirements of the Distinguished Service Cross. The member must have been aware of the great personal danger to himself/herself prior to the performance of the act and the act must have involved an imminent, actual and substantial threat to the member’s life. This award will be a medal, pin and a certificate presented by the Chief of Police.

The department presented one Medal of Honor award in 2017.

Sergeant Tyler Riessland (2016 incident)
On May 10, 2016, at 11:55 P.M., a carjacking occurred at the Wendy’s Restaurant, 15400 East Colfax Avenue. The suspect, Stephen Shuster, was armed with a handgun and took a white Jeep Cherokee from the owner. Shuster fled south on Chambers Road, followed by associates in a red Dodge Challenger. Officers observed the Jeep and Dodge on East Mississippi Avenue. Officers attempted to stop both vehicles. Shuster made a turn and rammed one of the patrol vehicles. The Dodge was stopped, but Shuster continued to elude officers for approximately fifteen more minutes. Shuster continued south through the city, at times driving on the wrong side of roadways. In the area of Aurora Parkway and E-470, the roadway ended. Sergeant Riessland used this location to tactically PIT the Jeep. The Jeep spun and was quickly pinned by Sergeant Riessland and Officer Benda. Shuster raised his handgun and pointed it at the officers. He was immediately engaged by Sergeant Riessland and Officer Benda. Seeing the gun still in Shuster’s hand, Sergeant Riessland jumped onto the hood of the Jeep and positioned himself directly in front of Shuster. Sergeant Riessland maintained this tactical position until a female passenger was removed from the Jeep and Shuster was disarmed. Sergeant Riessland demonstrated extraordinary courage by engaging Shuster and placing himself between the threat and other officers. Officer Benda demonstrated exceptional bravery by engaging Shuster, despite an imminent risk of injury or death. Officer Jones and Officer Ortiz demonstrated a high level of professionalism during the confrontation with the armed carjacking suspect.
Distinguished Service Cross

The Distinguished Service Cross may be awarded by the Chief of Police to members who distinguish themselves by demonstrating exceptional bravery despite an imminent risk of serious bodily injury or death. A member may be aware or unaware of great personal peril to himself/herself prior to the performance of the act. This award will be a medal, pin and a certificate presented by the Chief of Police.

The department presented 21 Distinguished Service Cross awards in 2017.

Sergeant Edward Lopez, Sergeant Sean Mitchell, Officer Roland Albert, Officer Paul Davis, Officer Steven Ficco, Officer Brad Graham, Officer Paul Jerothe, Officer David Krieger, Officer Jon Marek, Officer Nicholas Muldoon, Officer Scott Osgood, Officer Steve Ouilliber, Officer David Sutherland, Officer Scott Wicklund

On June 10, 2017, at 7:25 P.M., Officers were called to 11992 East Archer Place to check the welfare of a woman who had been assaulted. The suspect, Curtis Jackson, had assaulted his girlfriend, then barricaded the two third floor apartment doors with furniture and large appliances. His girlfriend had three young children in the apartment. Jackson refused to allow anyone to leave the apartment and he had access to a firearm. The S.W.A.T. team was notified. Negotiations with Jackson were unsuccessful and a hostage rescue plan was initiated. As part of this operation, Deputies with the Arapahoe County Sheriff's Office Bomb Squad were requested to assist. Once the teams were ready to make entry for the rescue, officers had to be placed on ladders outside the apartment windows to verify the locations of everyone inside. When the woman and her children were separated from Jackson, the doors were breached with explosives and entry was made. One team of officers rescued the woman and her children while the other team of officers swiftly arrested Jackson. All members of the entry operation distinguished themselves by demonstrating exceptional bravery, despite an imminent risk of injury or death.

Lieutenant John Tollakson, Sergeant Gregory Garcia, Officer Grant Peet

On July 9, 2017, at 2:50 A.M. Officers were dispatched to an apartment fire at 15790 East Alameda Parkway. Officers arrived to find the building engulfed in flames. Officer Grant Peet, Sergeant Greg Garcia, and Lieutenant John Tollakson began evacuating residents. The hallway and stairway were blocked by flames, so the officers broke windows and began helping residents out of the lower apartments. A woman emerged from a burning second floor apartment. Smoke made it difficult for her to climb down or jump. Sergeant Garcia climbed the balconies to reach her. Sergeant Garcia lowered the woman to Officer Peet and Lieutenant Tollakson. Officer Peet and Lieutenant Tollakson entered one of the lower apartments that had filled with smoke. They located a man and quickly evacuated him to safety. Additional officers arrived and checked the remaining apartments. No other residents were
located. The woman from the balcony was hospitalized for smoke inhalation. The man from the lower apartment was not injured. All three officers were treated for smoke inhalation. Officer Peet was treated for burns he received to his arms. Lieutenant John Tollakson, Sergeant Greg Garcia, and Officer Grant Peet worked as a team to locate and evacuate the residents of the burning building.

Officer Mark Simmerman
On July 24, 2017, at 4:50 P.M., Officers Mark Simmerman and Christopher Sloan responded to the 1400 block of Lima Street. A hysterical female called 911, reporting that a man was trying to kill himself with a knife. As Officer Simmerman arrived, he heard glass breaking and observed the man by an apartment door. The man was holding a large knife and was bleeding heavily from a wound to his arm. Officer Simmerman, still alone, was confronted by the man who was trying to get Officer Simmerman to shoot him. Officer Simmerman noted several people had come out and were standing in close proximity to the man. Officer Simmerman kept the man's attention focused on him, trying to keep him from trying to harm innocent bystanders. The man slashed the air with his knife, at one point spattering blood on Officer Simmerman. Officer Simmerman maintained his composure and tactical position, continuing to reason with the man. Officer Simmerman's tactics seemed to keep the man occupied so he was not threatening anyone else and not attacking the officer. Officer Christopher Sloan arrived and positioned himself next to Officer Simmerman. Both officers continued to negotiate with the man and kept him from attacking them or innocent bystanders. Their actions also kept the man focused on them, preventing him from trying to harm himself. Officer Sloan successfully deployed his Taser and both officers quickly secured the man. Due to their actions, the man was transported to the hospital and got treatment for both his physical injuries and mental health issues. Officers Simmerman and Sloan displayed a high level of dedication to protecting others. Their actions ensured the safety of innocent bystanders, as well as the safety of the armed individual.

Officer Virgil Majors
On November 12, 2017, at 3:40 P.M., Officers responded to the 17000 block of East Arkansas Avenue where a man was threatening to kill himself. It was reported that he had a gun in his bathrobe. As Officers arrived, the man walked out of his house, wearing a bath robe. The man told Officers that he wanted them to shoot him. Several Officers secured the perimeter and began negotiating with him. He was not listening and appeared to be intoxicated. He kept manipulating something in his pocket and it quickly became apparent that he had a handgun in his robe. He kept walking back and forth, turning away from the Officers, and not responding to them. At one point he had his back to the Officers and it appeared he was heading back into the house. Officer Virgil Majors rushed the man from behind and quickly secured his arms, preventing him from retrieving his gun. This allowed time for the other officers to react and grab the man. The man reacted violently and it took several officers to finally secure him. Officers safely arrested the man without anyone being seriously injured. Two fully loaded handguns were recovered from his robe. Due to their actions, the incident ended peacefully and the man was transported to the hospital where he received treatment for his mental health issues.

Officer Jason Condrey
On December 1, 2017, at 11:30 A.M. Police Dispatch received a call that the house at 3678 South Zeno Way had exploded and was burning. Officer Jason Condrey was the first officer to arrive. Two family members had escaped. They told Officer Condrey that their father and brother were trapped in the basement. The basement was filled with dense smoke and Officer Condrey had no idea where the fire was located or what was burning. He heard the two men screaming for help and chose to immediately enter the house. He quickly located the son and rushed him to the back yard. Both he and the son were overcome by the smoke. Officer Condrey paused momentarily for some fresh air and returned to the basement in search of the father. He located the father and carried him up to the back yard. Both the father and his son were severely burned. Officer Condrey fought through the effects of the smoke to
direct assisting officers as they arrived. It took several minutes for fire and medical personnel to arrive and get to the back yard. The explosion and fire were linked to flammable liquids that the men were using to remove floor tile. The intense smoke and lack of oxygen in the basement would have quickly killed both men had they not been immediately evacuated by Officer Condreay. Officer Jason Condreay demonstrated exceptional bravery, despite the imminent risk of injury or death and was treated for smoke inhalation after this incident.

**Officer Patrick Benda (2016 incident)**

On May 10, 2016, at 11:55 P.M., a carjacking occurred at the Wendy’s Restaurant, 15400 East Colfax Avenue. The suspect, Stephen Shuster, was armed with a handgun and took a white Jeep Cherokee from the owner. Shuster fled south on Chambers Road, followed by associates in a red Dodge Challenger. Officers observed the Jeep and Dodge on East Mississippi Avenue. Officers attempted to stop both vehicles. Shuster made a turn and rammed one of the patrol vehicles. The Dodge was stopped, but Shuster continued to elude officers for approximately fifteen more minutes. Shuster continued south through the city, at times driving on the wrong side of roadways. In the area of Aurora Parkway and E-470, the roadway ended. Sergeant Riessland used this location to tactically PIT the Jeep. The Jeep spun and was quickly pinned by Sergeant Riessland and Officer Benda. Shuster raised his handgun and pointed it at the officers. He was immediately engaged with gunfire by Sergeant Riessland and Officer Benda. Seeing the gun still in Shuster’s hand, Sergeant Riessland jumped onto the hood of the Jeep and positioned himself directly in front of Shuster. Sergeant Riessland maintained this tactical position until a female passenger was removed from the Jeep and Shuster was disarmed. Sergeant Riessland demonstrated extraordinary courage by engaging Shuster and placing himself between the threat and other officers. Officer Benda demonstrated exceptional bravery by engaging Shuster, despite an imminent risk of injury or death. Officer Jones and Officer Ortiz demonstrated a high level of professionalism during the confrontation with the armed carjacking suspect.
**Purple Heart**

The Purple Heart may be awarded by the Chief of Police to any member who sustains a gunshot wound, stab wound, or serious injury, under aggravated and hostile circumstances, which could have resulted in death or could potentially result in a permanent disability, which may force the member to retire. This award will be a medal, pin, and a certificate presented by the Chief of Police.

The department did not present a Purple Heart award in 2017.
Life Saving Award

The Life Saving Award may be awarded by the Chief of Police to members who personally save a life. The life-saving effort will normally involve one of the learned life supporting processes: mouth-to-mouth resuscitation, cardio-pulmonary resuscitation, the Heimlich maneuver for choking victims, or the control of severe bleeding. To merit this award, the member’s actions must be significant. Additionally, the award is only bestowed to the member if the victim survives the incident. The request for a life-saving award will be accompanied by a document from witnesses or an attending physician stating the methods applied contributed significantly to the victim’s survival. This award will only apply when victims are at imminent risk of death. This will normally not include deliberate actions taken by the victim or victims, unless the victim or victims have inflicted injury upon themselves that is actually life threatening. This award will be a pin and certificate presented by the Chief of Police.

The department presented 10 Life Saving awards in 2017.

Officer Francine Martinez
On April 9, 2017, at about 10:30 P.M., 911 call-takers received calls from citizens at the King Soopers store located at 3190 South Parker Road. The callers reported that a man had either overdosed on drugs or was attempting suicide in the restroom of the store. The callers reported that the man was unconscious and having difficulty breathing. Officer Francine Martinez was the first officer to arrive at the store. Officer Martinez quickly located the man and assessed his condition. Officer Martinez noticed a ligature tied around one of his arms, which lead her to believe the man was experiencing a drug overdose. Officer Martinez repositioned the man where she could administer first aid. She again assessed the man and realized his condition was quickly deteriorating. Officer Martinez administered an emergency dose of NARCAN to the man and began Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation (CPR). By the time paramedics arrived to transport the man to the hospital, he was showing signs of improvement. Once at the hospital, the man recovered to the point where he could speak. It was learned that he was a drug user and had overdosed on a mixture of Heroin and Xanax. The mixture would have proved to be fatal if Officer Martinez had not intervened.

Officer Jose Ortiz
On April 30, 2017, at 11:48 P.M., Officer Jose Ortiz responded to an emergency call in the 11000 block of East Harvard Avenue. The caller was a woman who reported that her husband was unconscious and not breathing. She was unable to locate his pulse. Officer Ortiz was the first officer to arrive. He quickly located the man in the bedroom and assessed his condition. The man was indeed unconscious, not breathing, and had no pulse. Sergeant Reginald DePass assisted Officer Ortiz in getting the man from the bed to the floor. Officer Ortiz began Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation (CPR). After several minutes, paramedics arrived and again assessed the man’s condition. The man had regained a faint pulse and electrical activity was detected. He was transported to the Medical Center of Aurora in very critical condition. The thirty-eight year old man remained hospitalized for five days. He recovered and returned to his family.
Officer Ethan Snow
On May 17, 2017, at 11:20 P.M., officers were dispatched to the 2600 block of South Xanadu Way. A female caller reported that someone had cut her grandson with a knife. Officer Ethan Snow was the first officer to arrive. Officer Snow found the 35 year old victim in the bathroom. Officer Snow noted the victim had a cut which went from his throat to the middle of his left ear. The victim was holding his neck, but he could not stop the bleeding. It became obvious to Officer Snow the victim had sustained a potentially life-threatening injury. Officer Snow realized that without immediate action, the victim would quickly bleed to death. Officer Snow used a washcloth to apply pressure to the man’s neck. The washcloth quickly became saturated and was not slowing the loss of blood. The victim began to lose consciousness. When medical personnel arrived, Officer Snow obtained gauze from them and packed the open wound in the victim’s neck. Officer Snow maintained pressure on the wound and remained with the victim the entire time while the victim was moved to an ambulance and transported to the hospital. Officer Snow did not leave the victim until he was relieved by the surgeon at the hospital. The victim was rushed into surgery and repairs were made to his left carotid artery. The victim was stabilized and recovered. The surgeons involved stated that without Officer Snow’s actions, the victim would have bled to death before he could be taken to the hospital.

Officer Steven Spanos
On July 12, 2017, at 10:40 P.M. Officers responded to an emergency call in the 1100 block of North Chester Street. The caller reported that their fifty year old father was possibly having a stroke. The man collapsed and was having difficulty breathing. Officer Steven Spanos was one of the first officers to arrive. The family members were all standing outside the residence when officers arrived. Officer Spanos quickly entered the home and found the man on the floor in the bedroom. The man was unconscious and not breathing. It became apparent to Officer Spanos that the man had suffered a stroke or heart attack. Officer Spanos began providing the man with Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation (CPR). Officer Spanos continued doing CPR for several minutes until medical personnel arrived. When medical personnel arrived, the man had regained a heartbeat. He was transported to University Hospital. Doctors determined the man had experienced a severe heart attack. Doctors stated that the man would not have survived had Officer Spanos not performed CPR. The man recovered and was able to return to his home and family.

Officer Christopher Ozaluk
On August 30, 2017, at 10:30 P.M., Officers were dispatched to the apartments at 17300 East Warren Place on a reported stabbing. The caller was a young man, reporting that his father had been stabbed in the arm and was losing consciousness. Officers arrived and contacted the boy and his mother. With no details or suspect information, the officers removed the woman and boy from the apartment. Officers then conducted a sweep of the apartment for victims and/or suspects. Officer Christopher Ozaluk was one of the officers to find the injured man. He was on the kitchen floor and had a severe cut to his right forearm. The man was losing a large amount of blood. Officer Ozaluk quickly placed a tourniquet on the man’s upper right arm, stopping the bleeding. Officer Ozaluk remained with the man until medical personnel arrived and transported him. It was later learned that the 43 year old man had attempted suicide by cutting his arm. Doctors at University Hospital believed that the wound inflicted by the man would have been fatal had Officer Ozaluk not applied a tourniquet to his arm.

Officer Dustin Petersen
On September 9, 2017, at 2:10 A.M., Officer Dustin Petersen responded to 1601 Alton Street, where callers reported seeing a woman on the floor of the building lobby. The callers thought the woman was deceased. Officer Petersen quickly located the woman and evaluated her condition. The woman was unconscious and having difficulty breathing. Officer Petersen detected a very faint pulse. Officer Petersen recognized the signs of a drug overdose and quickly administered Naloxone (NARCAN) to the
woman. By the time medical personnel arrived, the woman was responding to the NARCAN and her condition was improving. She was responsive to officers and her breathing stabilized. The woman was transported to the hospital and treated. Officer Petersen responded to the hospital and was able to talk with the woman. He learned that she had accidentally overdosed on a dangerous combination of Methamphetamine and Heroin. She had no memory of anything after she injected the drugs. Officer Petersen also learned that the other individuals who were with the woman earlier had left her alone in the building lobby. Doctors at the hospital advised that the use of the NARCAN by Officer Petersen saved the woman’s life.

Officer Kenneth Rickelman
On October 15, 2017, at 9:25 P.M., Officer Kenneth Rickelman responded to a serious accident at East Colfax Avenue and Alton Street. The accident involved a vehicle striking a pedestrian. Officer Rickelman arrived to find a group of people yelling at the driver of the car. The injured pedestrian was lying face down on the street. Officer Rickelman quickly assessed the pedestrian and noted the man was unconscious and not breathing. Officer Rickelman rolled the man over and began Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation (CPR). After a while, the man began breathing and Officer Rickelman enlisted the help of a citizen to monitor the man’s pulse. Officer Rickelman maintained contact with the injured man, assessing his injuries. Suddenly the man ceased breathing. Officer Rickelman began CPR for a second time. He continued CPR until medical personnel arrived and relieved him. The man was transported to the University Hospital and rushed into surgery. At 11:00 P.M. the man’s condition was still listed as serious. Medical treatment was successful and the man went into recovery. His condition continued to improve and he has since recovered from his injuries. Medical professionals at the University of Colorado Hospital credit Officer Rickelman with saving the man’s life. Had Officer Rickelman not performed CPR, the man would not have survived long enough to be transported and treated for his serious injuries.

Officer Joseph Sullivan
On October 16, 2017, at 10:20 P.M., Officers responded to a house in the 11000 block of East Ford Avenue on a welfare check. The caller stated that a man they knew at that address was attempting to hang himself. They were not with the man, but were watching a broadcast on his Facebook page. They reported seeing the man hanging himself from a light fixture, then the broadcast ended. Officers Joseph Sullivan and Delbert Tisdale arrived and entered the residence. They located a woman, who stated she was in the home with her father. She said the father was in another room and she had no idea why the officers were called. Officers Sullivan and Tisdale checked the residence and found her father in his bedroom. He was hanging from a light fixture by a belt placed tightly around his neck. He was unconscious and not breathing. Officer Sullivan quickly cut the belt and lowered the man to the floor. He began giving the man Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation (CPR). Officer Sullivan continued CPR for several minutes until he was relieved by paramedics. When the man was transported, he had regained a heartbeat and was breathing. The forty-six year old man was taken to the Medical Center of Aurora, where he recovered and returned to his family. Medical personnel credited Officer Sullivan with the man’s survival and recovery.

Officer Douglas Wilkinson
On November 21, 2017, at 8:45 P.M., Officer Douglas Wilkinson responded to the 10700 block of East Exposition Avenue on an emergency medical call. The caller stated that a woman had collapsed and was not breathing. Officer Wilkinson arrived and was directed to the apartment where the woman had collapsed. There was a language barrier, which added to the confusion and difficulty of the call. Officer Wilkinson entered an apartment filled with upset people and crying children. The woman, identified as the mother, was on a couch. Officer Wilkinson assessed her condition and immediately positioned her on the floor, where he began Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation (CPR). Officer Wilkinson remained calm
and enlisted the help of family members to guide paramedics to his location. Officer Wilkinson continued CPR until the woman regained a heartbeat. Medical personnel transported her to the Medical Center of Aurora. She was in critical condition, but later recovered and returned to her family. The emergency physician credited Officer Wilkinson with saving the woman’s life.

**Videographer Jon Billingsley**

On November 27, 2017, at 1:40 P.M., a City of Aurora employee suddenly collapsed on the exterior deck of the City Café. Police Videographer Jon Billingsley and Water employee Melissa Toering were outside near the man and quickly went to his aid. The man was unconscious and not breathing. His complexion began to turn blue. Melissa tried to check his mouth for obstructions, but his jaw was clenched tight. It became apparent to Jon and Melissa that the man was experiencing some type of seizure. Jon began chest compressions and Melissa began giving the man mouth-to-mouth breaths. The two continued this application of Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation (CPR) until the man began to breathe on his own. He regained consciousness and Jon and Melissa remained with him until medical personnel arrived. Both Jon and Melissa worked to keep him calm and continued to provide him aid until he could be moved to the hospital. It was later learned that the man had experienced a severe epileptic seizure. He recovered and returned to work. The immediate actions taken by Jon Billingsley and Melissa Toering contributed greatly to the man’s survival and recovery.
Meritorious Service Ribbon

The Meritorious Service Ribbon may be awarded by the Chief of Police for service rendered in the line of duty when a member, because of diligence and perseverance, performs difficult tasks under unusual circumstances and goes far beyond that which is normally expected of members. This award will be a pin and certificate presented by the Chief of Police.

The department presented 42 Meritorious Services Ribbons in 2017.

Sergeant Michael Gaskill, Sergeant Mark Hildebrand, Agent Nathan Meier, Agent Peter Page, Agent Pete Szuch, Officer Douglas Pearson, Officer Michael Tilton, Officer Jonathan Dennis, Officer Brent Maksyn, Officer Eugene VanDyk, Officer Wilburt Hinton, Officer Jeremy McElroy, Arapahoe County Sheriff’s Deputy Charles Butterfield, Arapahoe County Sheriff’s Deputy Eric Smith, Arapahoe County Sheriff’s Deputy Matt Davis, Denver Police Officer Eric Shurley, 18th Judicial District Deputy District Attorney Clinton McKenzie, 18th Judicial District Deputy District Attorney Darcy Kofol, 18th Judicial District Deputy District Attorney Tom Byrnes, 18th Judicial District Deputy District Attorney Dan Siedel, Rocky Mountain High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area Analyst Kevin Wong, Rocky Mountain High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area Analyst Steve Boatwright

In the spring of 2016 through the summer of 2017, members of the Gang Intervention Unit (GIU) led a major complex investigation involving a violent criminal street gang. Early in 2016, GIU began investigating the “Rich Boy Gang” (RBG) which is an Aurora-born gang comprised of juveniles and young adults. GIU began by gathering intelligence information on the gang. The development of membership rosters, understanding of the gang’s origins, and garnering individual information such as monikers and Facebook accounts proved vital early on. These proactive steps along with street enforcement, electronic surveillance and the cultivation of confidential informants resulted in GIU finding an immediate investigatory resolution to several shootings involving RBG in the spring of 2016. RBG Criminal Street Gang members and associates were arrested and charged in several jurisdictions, including Denver, Arapahoe, Adams, and Douglas Counties, with numerous crimes to include Murder, Attempted Murder, First Degree Assault, Aggravated Robbery, and Motor Vehicle Theft, as well as other crimes. With the help of social media, RBG grew and developed into a sizable violent gang with approximately 200 members. GIU provided investigative oversight, took a lead role in investigating gang-motivated, and gang-related crimes involving RBG. The gang continued to grow and spread across the metro Denver area quickly. In the fall of 2016, GIU teamed up with the Metro Gang Task Force (MGTF), the Denver Police Department and the Arapahoe County District Attorney’s Office, to form an RBG Task Force, to complete a complex metro-wide investigation. The established goal was to disrupt and dismantle the gang by indicting several of the most influential and violent members with the Colorado Organized Crime and Control Act (COCCA). Numerous members of RBG were arrested and charged with COCCA charges. Members of the RBG Task Force authored and served over 30 search warrants, to include cell phones, residences, vehicles, and Facebook accounts. It was through hard work and perseverance, this team of Law Enforcement professionals disrupted and dismantled the organization of the Rich Boy Gang. This team of investigators and prosecutors are commended for the significant impact they have made on the RBG, reducing violence caused by RBG and increased the safety of the citizens in Aurora and in the Denver Metro Area.
Arapahoe County Sheriff’s Sergeant John Vaala, Arapahoe County Sheriff’s Investigator Craig Clark, Arapahoe County Sheriff’s Deputy Duane Fox, Arapahoe County Sheriff’s Deputy Bryan Shay, Arapahoe County Sheriff’s Deputy Brad Zbrowski

On June 10, 2017, at 7:25 P.M., Officers were called to 11992 East Archer Place to check the welfare of a woman who had been assaulted. The suspect, Curtis Jackson, had assaulted his girlfriend, then barricaded the two third floor apartment doors with furniture and large appliances. His girlfriend had three young children in the apartment. Jackson refused to allow anyone to leave the apartment and he had access to a firearm. The S.W.A.T. team was notified. Negotiations with Jackson were unsuccessful and a hostage rescue plan was initiated. As part of this operation, Deputies with the Arapahoe County Sheriff’s Office Bomb Squad were requested to assist. Once the teams were ready to make entry for the rescue, officers ascended ladders outside the apartment windows to verify the locations of everyone inside. When the woman and her children were separated from Jackson, the doors were breached with explosives and entry was made. One team of officers rescued the woman and her children while the other team of officers swiftly arrested Jackson. All members of the entry operation distinguished themselves by demonstrating exceptional bravery, despite an imminent risk of injury or death.

Officer Christopher Sloan

On July 24, 2017, at 4:50 P.M., Officers Mark Simmerman and Christopher Sloan responded to the 1400 block of Lima Street. A hysterical female called 911, reporting that a man was trying to kill himself with a knife. As Officer Simmerman arrived, he heard glass breaking and observed the man by an apartment door. The man was holding a large knife and was bleeding heavily from a wound to his arm. Officer Simmerman, still alone, was confronted by the man who was trying to get Officer Simmerman to shoot him. Officer Simmerman noted several people had come out and were standing in close proximity to the man. Officer Simmerman kept the man’s attention focused on him, trying to keep him from harming innocent bystanders. The man slashed the air with his knife, at one point spattering blood on Officer Simmerman. Officer Simmerman maintained his composure and tactical position, continuing to reason with the man. Officer Simmerman's tactics seemed to keep the man occupied so he was not threatening anyone else and not attacking the officer. Officer Christopher Sloan arrived and positioned himself next to Officer Simmerman. Both officers continued to negotiate with the man and kept him from attacking them or innocent bystanders. Their actions also kept the man focused on them, preventing him from harming himself. Officer Sloan successfully deployed his Taser and both officers quickly secured the man. Due to their actions, the man was transported to the hospital and got treatment for both his physical injuries and mental health issues. Officers Simmerman and Sloan displayed a high level of dedication to protecting others. Their actions ensured the safety of innocent bystanders, as well as the safety of the armed individual.

Officer Edward Clements, Officer Nicholas Steele

On September 18, 2017, at 2:00 A.M., Aurora Police officers were dispatched to a structure fire at 1208 Dallas Street. Officers arrived to find flames and heavy smoke coming from the upper floors of the apartment building. Officers were confronted with citizens hanging out of windows, pleading for help. Officers Edward Clements, Josiah Coe, Nicholas Steele, and Sammie Wicks were the first officers on scene. The Officers located a pickup truck that had several ladders on it. The officers got the ladders off the truck and began placing them against the building. Some residents were able to use the ladders, while others were too high and out of reach. One resident was prepared to drop a child to the officers until the officers convinced them to wait for help. Prior to the arrival of fire personnel, Officer Steele climbed a ladder and removed three residents from the second floor. Officer Clements climbed a ladder and removed another resident from the second floor. The four Officers continued to assist both the residents and the fire personnel until everyone was accounted for and the fire was under control. These Officers are recognized for their actions in rescuing the tenants from the burning apartment building.
Officer Todd Arnston, Officer Joseph Duran
On September 27, 2017, at 10:35 P.M., Officer Todd Arnston and Officer Joseph Duran responded to a single vehicle accident in the 15500 block of East Mississippi Avenue. Citizens reported that a vehicle had gone off the bridge and was upside down in the creek. Callers reported that the driver was trapped in the vehicle, which was filling with water. It was raining and the creek water level had increased. The front end of the vehicle was submerged in a deep portion of the creek. Officer Arnston waded into the creek and got to the vehicle. Seeing a man inside, he quickly broke out a window so he could communicate with the man and assess his injuries. Officer Duran arrived quickly and waded in to assist. The officers removed the man from the car and carried him up from the creek. Medical personnel arrived a few minutes later, as the officers were evaluating the man and checking his injuries. The man was injured and disoriented. It was apparent that he would not have been able to get out of his vehicle before the vehicle filled with water. The officers learned that another vehicle had turned in front of the man, causing him to swerve and lose control, flipping his car and landing in the creek. The quick actions of Officer Arnston and Officer Duran prevented him from being overcome by the creek water and enabled medical personnel to treat the injured man with very little delay.

Officer Ethan Snow, Officer Paulmichael Trener
On September 29, 2017, at 5:00 P.M. Officers Ethan Snow and Paulmichael Trener noticed a bank robbery call about to be aired on their computer. The robbery was occurring at the Chase Bank on South Havana Street. Prior to the call being broadcast, the officers responded to the bank. The officers arrived and positioned themselves where they could observe the interior of the bank without alerting the suspect or frightening the existing customers. The officers were able to identify the suspect and coordinated an arrest plan with arriving assist officers. As the suspect exited the bank Officers Snow and Trener attempted to detain him. The suspect fled on foot, with both officers in pursuit. Perimeter officers attempted to stop the suspect with a Taser, but it was not successful. The suspect ran into the side of a patrol car, but he quickly recovered and continued to flee. Officer Snow fired his Taser while running after the suspect. The Taser was effective and Officers Snow and Trener quickly secured the suspect. A handgun was taken from the suspect’s pocket. In an interview with FBI Agents the suspect confessed to committing three bank robberies. These officers quickly responded to the bank, identified the suspect, coordinated an arrest plan with assisting officers, and captured the bank robbery suspect after a lengthy foot chase. The suspect was armed with a firearm, but due to the officer’s actions none of the responders was harmed and the suspect was quickly arrested.

Sergeant Jason Moore, Sergeant Justin Shipley, Officer Michael Bender, Officer Andres Cardenas, Officer Brooke Mourey, Officer Chad Warner
On November 12, 2017, at 3:40 P.M., Officers responded to the 17000 block of East Arkansas Avenue where a man was threatening to kill himself. It was reported that he had a gun in his bathrobe. As Officers arrived, the man walked out of his house, wearing a bathrobe. The man told Officers that he wanted them to shoot him. Several Officers secured the perimeter and began negotiating with him. He was not listening and appeared to be intoxicated. He kept manipulating something in his pocket, and it quickly became apparent that he had a handgun in his robe. He kept walking back and forth, turning away from the Officers, and not responding to them. At one point he had his back to the Officers and it appeared he was heading back into the house. Officer Virgil Majors rushed the man from behind and quickly secured his arms, preventing him from retrieving his gun. This allowed time for the other officers to react and grab the man. The man reacted violently and it took several officers to finally secure him. Officers safely arrested the man without anyone being seriously injured. Two fully loaded handguns were recovered from his robe. Due to their actions, the incident ended peacefully and the man was transported to the hospital where he received treatment for his mental health issues.
Officer Cody Jones and Officer Jose Ortiz (2016 incident)
On May 10, 2016, at 11:55 P.M., a carjacking occurred at the Wendy’s Restaurant, 15400 East Colfax Avenue. The suspect, Stephen Shuster, was armed with a handgun and took a white Jeep Cherokee from the owner. Shuster fled south on Chambers Road, followed by associates in a red Dodge Challenger. Officers observed the Jeep and Dodge on East Mississippi Avenue. Officers attempted to stop both vehicles. Shuster made a turn and rammed one of the patrol vehicles. The Dodge was stopped, but Shuster continued to elude officers for approximately fifteen more minutes. Shuster continued south through the city, at times driving on the wrong side of roadways. In the area of Aurora Parkway and E-470, the roadway ended. Sergeant Riessland used this location to tactically PIT the Jeep. The Jeep spun and was quickly pinned by Sergeant Riessland and Officer Benda. Shuster raised his handgun and pointed it at the officers. He was immediately engaged by Sergeant Riessland and Officer Benda. Seeing the gun still in Shuster’s hand, Sergeant Riessland jumped onto the hood of the Jeep and positioned himself directly in front of Shuster. Sergeant Riessland maintained this tactical position until a female passenger was removed from the Jeep and Shuster was disarmed. Sergeant Riessland demonstrated extraordinary courage by engaging Shuster and placing himself between the threat and other officers. Officer Benda demonstrated exceptional bravery by engaging Shuster, despite an imminent risk of injury or death. Officer Jones and Officer Ortiz demonstrated a high level of professionalism during the confrontation with the armed carjacking suspect.
Chief’s Commendation Certificate

The Chief’s Commendation Certificate may be awarded by the Chief of Police to a member for exceptional contribution to the progress of the Department, or to individuals who perform their duties in an unusually effective manner. The contribution must be adopted by the Department and increase the administrative or operational efficiency of the Department. The Chief of Police may recognize individual members of other law enforcement organizations, or multi-jurisdictional task forces, for this award.

The department presented 101 Chief’s Commendation Certificates in 2017.

Captain Christopher Juul, Captain Christian Lertch, Lieutenant John Tollakson, Sergeant Claude Burns, Sergeant Colleen Delena, Sergeant Michael Pitrusu, Sergeant Brandon Samuels, Officer Joshua Bebee, Officer James Benedict, Officer Cody Brown, Officer Aaron Bunch, Officer Jason Condrea, Officer Michael Dieck, Officer David Exstrom, Officer Kenneth Forrest, Officer Judy Gurley-Lutkin, Officer Darryl Huntsman, Officer Jeffrey Jacobs, Officer Christopher Johnson, Officer Jared Krieger, Officer Caleb Luallin, Officer W B Martin, Officer William Miller, Officer Travis Moody, Officer Matthew Neely, Officer Keith Neumann, Officer Jordan Odneal, Officer Jose Ortiz, Officer Daniel Pell, Officer Benjamin Petering, Officer Troy Rains, Officer Amber Roberts, Officer Tracy Rogers, Officer Joshua Schol, Officer Jeremy Wilson, Officer Christopher Yarborough, ACSO Deputy Robert Hovarth, ACSO Deputy Brian Starbuck

On June 10, 2017, at 7:25 P.M., Officers were called to 11992 East Archer Place to check the welfare of a woman who had been assaulted. The suspect, Curtis Jackson, had assaulted his girlfriend, then barricaded the two third floor apartment doors with furniture and large appliances. His girlfriend had three young children in the apartment. Jackson refused to allow anyone to leave the apartment and he had access to a firearm. The S.W.A.T. team was notified. Negotiations with Jackson were unsuccessful and a hostage rescue plan was initiated. As part of this operation, Deputies with the Arapahoe County Sheriff’s Office Bomb Squad were requested to assist. Once the teams were ready to make entry for the rescue, officers ascended ladders outside the apartment windows to verify the locations of everyone inside. When the woman and her children were separated from Jackson, the doors were breached with explosives and entry was made. One team of officers rescued the woman and her children while the other team of officers swiftly arrested Jackson. All members of the entry operation distinguished themselves by demonstrating exceptional bravery, despite an imminent risk of injury or death.

Sergeant Graham Dunne, Sergeant Edward Lopez, Sergeant Patrick Shaker, Agent Michael Thrapp, Officer Roland Albert, Officer Travis Beasley, Officer Tomas Campagna, Officer Steven Ficco, Officer Brad Graham, Officer Darwin Hanley, Officer Brett Iske, Officer Tim King, Officer Nicholas Muldoon, Officer Brian O’Halloran, Officer Scott Osgood, Officer Daniel Pell, Officer Benjamin Petering, Officer Robert Thompson, Officer Edward Vance, Officer Ryan Wenke, Officer David Zimmerman, Forensic Specialist Darvin Harrell

On September 29, 2017, at 5:00 P.M. Officers Ethan Snow and Paulmichael Trenery noticed a bank robbery call about to be aired on their computer. The robbery was occurring at the Chase Bank on South Havana Street. Prior to the call being broadcast, the officers responded to the bank. The officers arrived and positioned themselves where they could observe the interior of the bank without alerting the suspect or frightening the existing customers. The officers were able to identify the suspect and coordinated an arrest plan with arriving assist officers. As the suspect exited the bank Officers Snow and Trenery attempted to detain him. The suspect fled on foot, with both officers in pursuit. Perimeter officers attempted to stop the suspect with a Taser, but it was not successful. The suspect ran into the side of a patrol car, but he quickly recovered and continued to flee. Officer Snow fired his Taser while running after the suspect. The Taser was effective and Officers Snow and Trenery quickly secured the
suspect. A handgun was taken from the suspect’s pocket. In an interview with FBI Agents the suspect confessed to committing three bank robberies. These officers quickly responded to the bank, identified the suspect, coordinated an arrest plan with assisting officers, and captured the bank robbery suspect after a lengthy foot chase. The suspect was armed with a firearm, but due to the officer’s actions none of the responders was harmed and the suspect was quickly arrested.

Agent Todd Gill
On September 5, 2017, a trailer was stolen from the lot of the Crowne Plaza Hotel, 15500 E. 40th Avenue. The trailer contained a collection of prehistoric Megalodon teeth, fossils, and valuable gems. The collection was valued at $785,000.00. Detective Todd Gill was assigned the case. Detective Gill learned that some of the items were being advertised for sale on eBay. Detective Gill authored, obtained and served court orders for electronic records on several entities, to include eBay, PayPal, and Comcast. Through his actions, Detective Gill identified possible suspects and their locations. Detective Gill personally conducted surveillance and attempted to arrange purchases of the stolen items. Detective Gill’s investigation culminated with the execution of a search warrant at a residence on October 24, 2017. Approximately $700,000.00 of the stolen collection was recovered. Detective Gill coordinated the recovery, which was in another jurisdiction. Detective Gill displayed determination, persistence, patience, and a willingness to serve this victim and our community. His professionalism and dedication resulted in the recovery of prehistoric artifacts and fossils that would be impossible to replace. Detective Gill continues to search for the items which were not recovered.

Officer David McNamee, Officer Timothy Meehan, and Officer James Salazar
On December 1, 2017, at 11:30 A.M. Police Dispatch received a call that the house at 3678 South Zeno Way had exploded and was burning. Officer Jason Condreay was the first officer to arrive. Two family members had escaped. They told Officer Condreay that their father and brother were trapped in the basement. The basement was filled with dense smoke and Officer Condreay had no idea where the fire was located or what was burning. He heard the two men screaming for help and chose to immediately enter the house. He quickly located the son and rushed him to the back yard. Both he and the son were overcome by the smoke. Officer Condreay paused momentarily for some fresh air and returned to the basement in search of the father. He located the father and carried him up to the back yard. Both the father and his son were severely burned. Officer Condreay fought through the effects of the smoke to direct assisting officers as they arrived. It took several minutes for fire and medical personnel to arrive and get to the back yard. The explosion and fire were linked to flammable liquids that the men were using to remove floor tile. The intense smoke and lack of oxygen in the basement would have quickly killed both men had they not been immediately evacuated by Officer Condreay. Officers McNamee, Meehan and Salazar arrived a short time later and assisted with calming the victims and guiding the fire department to the backyard of the house.

Fallen Deputies Memorial Service Planning Team Members – Colorado Fallen Heroes Foundation

On December 31st, 2017 Deputy Zack Parrish of the Douglas County Sheriff’s Office was killed in the line of duty. Four other Officers were shot in the same incident. This line of duty death began one of the worst months law enforcement in Colorado has seen in recent history. On January 24th, 2018 Adams County Sheriff’s Deputy Heath Gumm was also killed in the line of duty. In both cases members of the Aurora Police Department stepped up to assist the affected agencies. APD Members of the Colorado Fallen Hero Foundation took a lead role in many of the aspects of the memorial planning for both Deputies. These members spent a minimum of 16 days in January involved in memorial planning and their work was clearly evident in the beautiful memorial services for both deputies. Both the Adams and Douglas County Sheriffs expressed immense gratitude to all the APD members who assisted. For representing the Aurora Police Department in an exemplary fashion and showing incredible support and compassion to their fellow law enforcement agencies these members should be commended for their actions.

Christopher Meschuk
Mr. Christopher Meschuk has volunteered his services and equipment to the Aurora Police Department Awards Board and the Annual Awards Ceremony since May of 2010. He DJs the dinner prior to each ceremony and then provides audio support, computer equipment and specialized lighting for the ceremony. During years where the ceremony was held in the City Council Chambers, Mr. Meschuk had to arrive extra early to set up lights and controllers in the Council Chambers and then into the lobby of the Aurora Municipal Center to set up speakers and other DJ equipment. Mr. Meschuk provided lighting and sound support during the Department’s special recognition ceremony for the July 20, 2012 shooting response. One year, the projectors and screens were not working in Council Chambers and Mr. Meschuk provided his own projector and cloth screens to project the ceremony presentation.

Chief’s Unit Citation
The Chief’s Unit Citation may be awarded by the Chief of Police to an entire unit whose members perform their assigned duties in an unusually effective manner. The Chief of Police may recognize units comprised of officers from the Aurora Police Department as well as other organizations, or multi-jurisdictional task forces, for this award.

The department presented five Chief’s Unit Citations in 2017.

Major Crime/Homicide Unit
In 2017 the members of the Major Crimes/Homicide Unit had an unusually busy year. With 30 homicide cases and several Officer Involved Shootings in the City the team, led by Sergeants Matt Fyles and Stephen Jokerst, was often pushed to its limits. In a 2 week period in May the team responded to 9 homicides, a highly abnormal amount in such a short time. Despite the high number of call-outs, to include responses to Denver on several Officer Involved Shooting cases the team continued to perform at exceptional levels, closing nearly all of the 30 cases. Some of the cases the team handled in 2017 were extremely complex and difficult from the start, with little to no suspect information. The skilled Detectives were able to develop leads, track down witnesses, and make numerous arrests.

Crimes Against Children Unit and Internet Crimes Against Children Unit
In 2017 the Crimes Against Children (CAC) and Internet Crimes Against Children (ICAC) units experienced an extremely busy year. The units worked their normal heavy caseloads but also experienced several high-profile cases, one involving school employees. These cases required extensive manpower, sensitivity and discretion, and exemplary Detective work. The units also handled 2 homicides with juvenile victims, both of which saw charges brought against the suspects. The teams worked tirelessly to
ensure that the most innocent of victims saw justice and continued to develop relationships with external partners, many of whom shared accolades for the exceptional work of these two teams.

K-9 Unit
This unit is extremely proactive and has put up tremendous productivity numbers throughout the past few years, but especially in 2017. The unit had over 1700 K9 specific calls for service and assists, taking part in hundreds of safe arrests. The unit also had a very low bite ratio, showing professionalism, very good tactics, strong decision making and excellent training. The unit assists many local and outside agencies on top of APD responsibilities, assists in training and enjoys a very strong reputation among many inside and outside department groups. The unit also enjoys a phenomenal social media and community presence, being involved in over 55 community events with audiences ranging from small children to community groups. The unit has exceptional backing and respect from the community and is one the most popular units in the city. Through professionalism, dedication and a superior work ethic, the unit has enjoyed tremendous success and is an extremely important part of the department and our city. The unit continues to prove themselves as second to none while handling an increased call load. Great job to each and every one of the K9 members.

District 3 PAR Team
An apartment in the 18300 block of East Flora Drive appeared on the District 3 PAR radar in June 2017 due to a nuisance reports from neighbors of loud noise, possible drug use and firearms. From June to December 2017, officers responded to over 85 calls for service at this location. The calls included trespassing, narcotics violation, disturbances and other various issues. It turns out this location was known via social media as "Dave's Garage", owned by Mr. David Boyle. The location became a "flop house" for many friends and associates. Throughout this investigation numerous arrests were made at this location which included possession of heroin, fraud, possession of financial devices, motor vehicle theft, larceny, burglary, and several warrants.

In July 2017, PAR officers started conducting enforcement/impact operations on this address several times a week making numerous contacts and several arrests. Activity at this location started to pick up during evenings and weekends. Officer Salazar and Sgt. Swart began giving regular updates on criminal activity at swing shift patrol briefings as well and sending numerous email updates directly to the area patrol officers. As activity at this address increased, Sgt. Swart contacted SRT advising them of the situation and requesting enforcement and surveillance assistance. Sgt. Swart met with Agt. Fanning of the "Safe Streets Task Force". From this conversation it was determined that "Safe Streets" was working active investigations regarding female sex trafficking and sexual activity with minors. Officer Salazar worked with Crime Analyst Dawn Tollakson to make an activity flowchart consisting of names of people involved, arrests, reports, and crimes associated with this location. This chart was then distributed to other units for their information. It was determined the scope of this investigation was growing larger and many different enforcement entities were now getting involved. Sgt. Swart organized an informational planning meeting with members from Safe Streets, SRT, PAR, Narcotics, Crime Analyst, Code Enforcement, and CMATT. From this meeting several new items of intel were brought up and shared. Extended enforcement and surveillance was conducted at this address. Impact enforcement investigation at this location lasted for a 6 month period, during which time in excess of 40 arrests were made of over 15 different suspects, to include Mr. Boyle being arrested 4 times for drugs, fraud and warrants. Officer Salazar put in countless hours of follow up interviews and conversations with neighbors who live around this address. He spoke with SRT and patrol members to give updates and coordinate enforcement efforts. Through research efforts Officer Salazar was able to track down Ms. Stephanie Boyle, David’s ex-wife and co-owner of the residence. Ms. Boyle is in the military, and was not aware of this activity, stating she has not been in contact with David for approximately 2 years. Ms. Boyle was very concerned about the criminal activity and immediately started legal proceedings to get
the residence placed solely in her name. During the eviction, drugs and drug paraphernalia were removed from the garage and several bank and financial transaction devices (checkbooks and credit cards) were recovered.

Every member of PAR 3 was active in bringing this issue to a successful resolution by conducting hundreds of hours of surveillance, over the 6 months, making several contacts and documenting activity, and making numerous arrests.

**Certificate of Appreciation – Citizen’s Award**

The Certificate of Appreciation, Citizen’s Award may be awarded by the Chief of Police to any citizen who renders valuable, courageous, or heroic assistance to members of the Aurora Police Department.

The department presented three **Certificates of Appreciations** in 2017.

**Evan Kust**

During the early afternoon hours of October 4, 2016, a 26-year-old female was home alone with her one-year-old son when she heard a knock at her apartment door. She answered and met an unknown male asking if she wanted her car washed. When she told the male that she wasn’t interested, he asked for water. When she refused that request, the male forced entry into her home, brutally attacked her, and sexually assaulted her at knifepoint.

Just nine days later, on October 13th, an 18-year-old female, living in the same apartment complex as the October 4th victim, called 911 after an unknown male of similar description attempted to force entry into her apartment door after asking for water. Moments after the 911 call was placed, Evan Kust, a commercial property maintenance employee working in the King Soopers parking lot at 1555 S Havana St, observed a male, wearing a hat and sunglasses, sprinting across the parking lot. At the same time, Mr. Kust heard police sirens coming into the area. Assuming these events might be connected, Mr. Kust called APD Dispatch and provided a description of the suspect. He then advised that he observed the male run behind a privacy wall at a nearby Key Bank, come out without the hat and sunglasses, and then casually walk into the nearby Buffalo Wild Wings Restaurant. Officers responded to the area and subsequently arrested Ricardo Corral-Venegas, a former Mexican police officer who was wanted out of Mexico for numerous sexual assaults.

Evidence later confirmed that Corral-Venegas was connected to the armed sexual assault and kidnapping of the 26-year-old female on October 4th, as well as the attempted sexual assault of the 18-year-old female from whose apartment he was running when Mr. Kust observed him. Mr. Kust later testified in Corral-Venegas’s Arapahoe County trial, which resulted in a conviction for both crimes. Without Mr. Kust’s quick thinking when he observed Corral-Venegas running through the King Soopers parking lot, the outcome of this case may have been tragically different.

**Terri Calvillo, RN**

On March 6, 2017, the Aurora Police Department received a call on an assault in progress at Shalom Park, 14800 E. Belleview Drive, involving two residents at the facility. Nursing staff advised dispatch that a male resident was using a cane and wheelchair pedal to assault a female. Staff advised dispatch that when they attempted to enter the room where the assault was occurring the male would threaten staff. A new employee to Shalom Park, RN Terri Calvillo, entered the room and positioned herself between the victim and the suspect preventing further injury to the female. Terri was able to speak to the suspect in a calm voice and console the victim while officers were on their way. As additional staff tried to enter the room, the suspect would threaten them, but Terri was able to get the suspects attention focused
back on her and keep other staff members safe. The suspect raised his arms holding the weapons and went towards Terri several times during the incident, yet Terri was still able to protect the victim and keep calm. Due to Terri’s actions she prevented further injury to the victim and additional staff members.

By building a rapport with the suspect Terri exhibited courage, bravery and compassion all while risking her own safety and was able to prevent more serious injuries to the victim and staff.

**Vincent Juarez**

On September 20, 2017 at approximately 2:14AM the Music Go Round located at 18541 E. Hampden Avenue, was burglarized by an unknown subject. The subject had broken out one of the front windows of the store and grabbed a guitar that was on display. Concerned Movie Tavern employee Vincent Juarez, who was out back by the trash bins, heard the glass break and went to the front of the store. Mr. Juarez discovered the subject in subdued clothing trying to climb out of the window with a black and white guitar in his hands. Mr. Juarez was able to grab the guitar from the subject's hand at which time the subject ran off. Mr. Juarez then notified police and was able to give them a description of the subject.

Mr. Juarez’s quick action led to the recovery of the stolen merchandise as well as trying to get the suspect in this case arrested via coordination with the police department.

**Community Commitment Certificate**

This may be awarded to members who, through their own efforts, display an unusually effective manner of employing the Aurora Police Department’s community commitment philosophy.

The department presented one **Community Commitment Certificate** in 2017.

**Officer Andrew Crowley**

On January 18th, 2018, Officer Andrew Crowley took a call for service at Mrachek Middle School, 1995 S. Telluride St. The reporting party wanted to report that her special needs daughter was being threatened and bullied at school by another student. Officer Crowley met with this RP and learned that her daughter was the target of severe verbal abuse. The RP was extremely frustrated with the school and was to the point of pulling her daughter out of Mrachek to be placed into a different school.

Officer Crowley was able to locate the suspect child and her family. While in contact with this family, Officer Crowley learned that the suspect was also a special needs child and her mother was aware of her bullying issues. This child had endured brain surgery at the age of 18 months old, which left this child severely disabled.

Officer Crowley realized that this call for service was bigger than just lecturing somebody or giving a child a summons. Officer Crowley took it upon himself to arrange a meeting between these two families so that they could be educated on each other’s complicated issues. Both families agreed to meet and this meeting took place on January 19th, 2018 at District 3. Both families expressed sincere gratitude to have been able to handle this dilemma in this way. In fact, both families were surprised that it took an Aurora Police Officer to coordinate this meeting which turned out to be a success. Both families took away a thorough understanding of each other's children and the issues they have to deal with.

**Excellence Award**

This award is presented to a career service member who continuously seeks excellence in practice and often “takes it to the next level.”
The department presented six **Excellence Awards** in 2017.

**Records Technician Nikolle Bunting**
Nikolle Bunting is an exemplary employee and leads the way for the future of records. She has learned a core function (PPW) within records in a short amount of time, and is beginning to learn NIBRS transcription as well. Nikolle strives to do her best every single day for her team and records. She embodies all of the Core4 principles and guides her team to follow her example. Nikolle is counted on by her supervisors to help train new employees in the advanced task of warrant entry, and remains their go to person when they have questions. Nikolle completes all of these tasks while working our front positions, as the graveyard shift has had minimal staffing for multiple years.

**Crime Analyst Robbin Hemphill and Administrative Specialist Mary Johnson**
In addition to their positions as Crime Analyst and Administrative Specialist, Robbin Hemphill and Mary Johnson each took on responsibility for coordinating the move of Police District Two operations to its new facility. The move involved relocating 118 members consisting of uniformed personnel, detectives, and administrative staff along with their equipment. This included designing a moving plan and schedule, coordinating logistics such as shred bin delivery and pick up, identifying computers and equipment for relocation, establishing decorative design within the building interior, and making arrangements with movers, I.T., Xerox, and Facilities.

Robbin and Mary worked tirelessly, not only ensuring a seamless move was accomplished, but then continued their efforts by organizing a "Grand Opening" event that hosted elected officials, city leaders, and public invitees. They are remarkably exceptional performers, who have proven to be invaluable in getting such a large project successfully completed.

They understand the value of working as a team to improve productivity and ensure successful outcomes within the district, regardless of the task at hand. They are self-motivated and do not have to be reminded about completing projects. Each is skilled at recognizing opportunities for high success by addressing complex situations, and taking steps towards solutions. Personnel assigned to the district have appreciated their ability to anticipate the needs of members, and their willingness to go above and beyond to provide support.

**Senior Crime Analyst Dawn Tollakson**
On September 08, 2017 FBI Rocky Mountain Safe Streets Task Force (RMSSTF) was assigned a burglary of the First Bank at 2300 S. Havana Street. Crime Analyst Dawn Tollakson contacted RMSSTF to advise she believed she had found two additional bank burglaries on South Havana Street and believed they were related. Ms. Tollakson analyzed the burglary pattern and found the crimes were committed within a one mile area on S. Havana Street, in the evening hours. Officer Bridget Johnson believed the suspect looked similar to Miftah Bule, who was wanted for another business burglary. Ms. Tollakson was able to complete a work up of the suspect, showing he lived close to the burglaries and put together a BOLO which was submitted to APD Patrol. Based on the BOLO being shared in the community, Bule was contacted and arrested at an Aurora Homeless Shelter.

During this time, between February 13, 2017 and October 4, 2017, a series of bank robberies occurred in the metro area to include five in Aurora by persons dubbed the “5 O’Clock Bandits”. Ms. Tollakson was aware the first robbery in the pattern that began at the Chase Bank at 5800 S Parker Road, and once possible suspects were identified via a citizen, Ms. Tollakson was instrumental in locating photographic evidence through the Photo Red Light and BOSS camera systems to place the suspects in the area of some of the robberies, as well as using photos she obtained to compare to surveillance photos of the suspect vehicles. The information Ms. Tollakson provided was used in conjunction with other
information gathered and led to the arrest of Gerry Sevall and Drayse Ballard, a father and son team, who were the “5 O’Clock Bandit” bank robbers.

In both of the above pattern crimes, Ms. Tollakson used an array of law enforcement data bases, her knowledge of the city of Aurora Traffic camera system, BOSS camera system and her unique ability to identify patterns to assist both Aurora PD and FBI RMSSTF in solving crimes across the city of Aurora and metro area.

**Crime Analyst Ruth Eisner**

Ruth Eisner is the very definition of “continuously seeks excellence in practice”. As the Crime Analyst assigned to help the Special Operations Bureau, Ruth is constantly having to demonstrate an exceptional level of competence in the realm of analytics. However, Ruth’s responsibilities do not end there. Ruth is also tasked with training new crime analysts joining the department, and providing or arranging ongoing training for all of the crime analysts. Ruth is always on a never-ending hunt for ways to do her work better, and ensuring that the information that the agency publishes is as accurate as it can possibly be. Finally, Ruth is the unofficial crime analyst to the Office of the Chief of Police. This means when one of the Chiefs needs the services of a crime analyst, Ruth is often the first person called. She will invariably drop whatever she is working on (or at least wrap it up quickly) and get right on the request presented by the Chief’s office.

Ruth always meets these never-ending requests for her services with aplomb and good humor, even when the requested analysis is needed “YESTERDAY!”, as is often the case. Her exceptional work and great attitude truly makes Ruth an Excellent employee and one of a kind.

**Senior Business Systems Analyst Dolores Schaeffer**

Dolores Schaeffer performs duties way beyond what is expected of her and is doing the job of three people. Dolores’ number one goal has always been, and continues to be, the security and integrity of every database and system used by police. She strives to keep the Police Department’s best interest at hand, as this is her baseline for decisions. Dolores follows policy and rules and has a reason for every decision she makes. Her extensive knowledge of the various applications is beyond comprehension for most employees. Last year, the department began working on the forced upgrade of Telestaff, and Dolores already knew what major changes would take place that would affect payroll processing. She is two steps ahead, recognizing a web based version is not compatible with Crystal Reports, currently used for processing payroll. Dolores rewrote every single report used to process payroll so in the event changes needed to be made immediately, we did not need to rely on I.T. to make corrections in a timely manner. This in itself was a huge undertaking, utilizing many hours all the while working on other applications and upgrades in the police department.

**Innovation Award**

The innovation award recognizes a member who has demonstrated or accomplished a core component of the Aurora Police Department. Criteria include: suggesting or developing new work methods that increase productivity; developing an effective solution to an existing difficult problem; developing and implementing a plan for the good of the community; or, generating novel and valuable ideas and using these ideas to improve processes, methods, systems, programs or services for his or her team or department.

The department presented six **Innovation Awards** in 2017.
Property Technician Sherrie Knodel
Sherrie Knodel has been working for the Aurora Police Department since 1988 and joined the Property & Evidence (P&E) Unit as a Property Technician in 2012. Technician Knodel has been instrumental in the creation, testing, and implementation of the disposition of evidence through the Municipal Disposal Site.

Technician Knodel was the only Property Technician selected to work with the IT Department to test the Disposal Site for effectiveness, efficiency, and accuracy. She began working with this site in the beginning of June, 2017. Technician Knodel was provided a list of approximately six sworn members of the Department to utilize during this testing period. Technician Knodel was responsible for researching each Municipal case within a specific timeframe to determine if it could possibly be eligible for disposal and then sending those disposal reviews through the site. As the testing period progressed, more and more sworn members were added. Technician Knodel provided necessary feedback to both her Supervisor and the IT Department to inform them of how her experience with the site was working and what the sworn members’ feedback was.

In September of 2017, a Special Order (17-07) was published instructing the Department that we are now utilizing this Municipal Disposal Site and the instructions on how to use it. The Department was able to go live with this automated site only due to the diligent work done by Technician Knodel, as well, of course, as the thorough and meticulous work from IT to create the site. The implementation of the Municipal Disposal Site has resulted in a more efficient and user-friendly disposal program for both sworn members as well as property personnel.

Records Technicians Sharon Halsey, Cheryl McCormick, Sandra Potter, Jon Thoms and Joyce Torres
The Aurora Police Department’s Records Section identified areas for improvement in the processing of electronic accident reports. The APD Records Traffic Team, consisting of Cheryl McCormick, Jon Thoms, Joy Torres, Sandie Potter, and Sharon Halsey, worked diligently to learn new technology solutions for tracking reports, have consistently tracked errors for training or software review, have created training material to assist others in learning this important task, and assisted with a procedural review with our Department’s Traffic Unit.

It is through their efforts that we will be more efficient in sharing knowledge throughout our Section. Their teamwork and willingness to support positive change in our Organization means that our Traffic Unit now has a streamlined review process reducing unnecessary routing of approximately 2000 reports annually, thereby allowing their valuable time to be used more effectively on needed review and follow up.

Superior Award

Records Technicians Heather Ellis, Alysia Hanifin and Stephanie Simmons
Records Technicians Stephanie Simmons, Heather Ellis and Alysia Hanifin have each worked for the Aurora Police Department Records Unit for under 2 years. All three employees volunteered to become Records Training Officers (RTO) without additional compensation. They have taken on this leadership role and have trained multiple new employees without hesitation. They are excellent at being positive role models, and this has shown in how our new employees conduct themselves. Without their tireless training, we would not have been able to train the multitude of new employees. Stephanie, Heather and Alysia have taken advantage of any opportunity for advancement that has been offered. They continue to learn as they train and provide valuable feedback when they see things that can be done in a more effective manner. They are seen by their peers as leaders and are often sought out for their knowledge and problem solving abilities.
Automated Complaint and Commendation Report

The Automated Complaint and Commendation System accepts and records all submissions. The Department designed the system to manage the complaints and commendations reported on sworn personnel.

During 2017, there were 521 complaints received online or entered by a Police Department member that involved 518 sworn members and three non-sworn members. (Please note: some complaints may include several officers).

Additionally, 31 commendations were received for sworn officers. There was one commendation submitted for non-sworn members of the Department.

2017 Automated Complaints and Commendations

![Pie Chart]

- Sworn Complaints (518)
- Non-Sworn Complaints (3)
- Sworn Commendations (32)
Automated Complaints by Type

The Automated Complaint System categorizes the submissions for the Department to analyze, determine trends and provide instruction if needed.

The system categorized the complaints received during 2017 as follows: Seven alleging an illegal search, one reported neglect of duty, 84 reported violations of court issues or missed court, four reported violations of Constitutional rights, ten allegations of unsatisfactory performance, four allegations of racial profiling, 29 reports of excessive use of force, 47 complaints of improper or incomplete investigations, 101 for other directives or SOPs not captured under the other types and 90 complaints of rudeness or professionalism issues.
Automated Complaints by Validity

In each of the complaint submissions received, the officer’s supervisor has investigated the complaint. The officer’s chain of command has reviewed the investigations before closing them.

The Department has reviewed each of the complaints and ascertained the validity of the complaint. From these there were 157 sustained, 81 not sustained, 192 unfounded, 81 within policy, two misunderstandings, and seven unknown due to unresponsive complainants.
Automated Complaints, Results

The Automated Complaint System records any corrective action taken by the Department as a result of the investigation. The results range from “none justified” to an order by the Chief for the Internal Affairs Bureau to formally investigate the complaint. Careful study and comparison of this information will reveal that more incidents result in some form of correction than incidents that are found to be valid. This is because the complaint may not be valid in light of the Department Directives, but the supervisor may determine the officer needs some degree of instruction to help him/her do a better job.

The results of the complaints submitted are as follows, in descending order of severity. The Chief of Police ordered the Internal Affairs Section to formally investigate 61 members. The Department issued 24 Written Reprimands for violations of Department Directives. A Written Reprimand is permanent discipline that remains in the officer’s file for his/her entire career. The Department issued 16 Corrective Action Reports instructing the officers to change their behavior. The Corrective Action Report is not discipline but a notice or warning to modify behavior. The Corrective Action Report remains in the officer’s file for one to two years, depending on his/her evaluation date and cycle. It is documentation of past problems and corrective measures taken to correct the behavior. The officer’s supervisors issued 43 Performance Appraisal Entry (PAE) reports documenting negative performance. The supervisors use the PAE reports as documentation to be included in the officers’ annual evaluations. On 39 occasions, the supervisors verbally counseled the officers. Two complaints were referred to mediation. The supervisors completed 11 Performance Appraisal Entry reports that were to document the investigation only (nothing negative toward the officer). The Department concluded in 320 of the complaints that the complaint was not valid and that no documentation was needed.

Automated Complaints - Results

- Referred to IAS (61)
- Written Reprimand (24)
- Corrective Action Report (16)
- PAE for Correction (43)
- PAE Documentation (11)
- No Documentation Needed (320)
- Mediation (2)
- Counseling Only (39)
Automated Complaints, Follow Up Contact Method

At the conclusion of the investigation the supervisor is required, if possible, to contact the complainant and explain the findings. The Automated Complaint System records show the supervisor contacted that person.

The supervisors contacted the complainant by telephone in 104 of the cases. The supervisors used e-mail 119 times. In 66 cases, the supervisor could not contact the complainant (anonymous complaint or attempted but unable to contact). The supervisor met the complainant in person 81 times.

Automated Complaints
Follow Up Contact Method
Automated Commendations by Type

The system categorized the 31 commendations received during 2017 as follows:

Six citizen submissions expressed appreciation for the officer. Three others reported a job well done. Two submissions stated the officer was professional. One reported the officer went above and beyond expectations and 19 expressed a thank you.
Automated Complaint and Commendation System, Miscellaneous Information on People Reporting

The automated complaint and commendation system allows the submitting person the opportunity to provide information about himself/herself. The system has a drop-down menu giving the person a choice of options to describe himself/herself. 88 of the people submitting a complaint or commendation indicated they were a citizen of Aurora. 84 indicated they were a non-resident. 65 said they were an employee member of the Department, and 86 indicated they were a government official.

Type of People Submitting Commendations and Complaints

- Resident (88) 27%
- Non-Resident (84) 27%
- Member (65) 20%
- City Official (86) 26%
Gender of People
Submitting Commendations and Complaints

- Male (144): 49%
- Female (93): 32%
- Unknown Gender (55): 19%

Reported Ethnicity of People
Submitting Commendations and Complaints

- White (136): 47%
- African American (52): 31%
- Latino (10): 4%
- Asian (1): >1%
- American Indian (0): >1%
- Arab (1): >1%
- Unknown (91): 0%
District and Bureau Discipline Report

During 2017, the Department completed and finalized 34 District / Bureau investigations. Each resulted in the Chief of Police ordering a Written Reprimand as discipline for the violation of one or more Department Directives. A Written Reprimand is permanent discipline that remains in the employee’s file for his/her career. The following is a summary of these cases for 2017:

Chief Metz and the Aurora Police Department recognize members of the Aurora Police Department have a right to privacy in the contents of their personnel files and expect the contents of these files will be held in confidence by their employer. This expectation and right to privacy flows from the United States Constitution, the Colorado Constitution, the Colorado Open Records Act, Colorado Revised Statutes § 24-72-201, et. seq., the Colorado Criminal Justice Records Act, Colorado Revised Statutes, § 24-72-301, et. seq., the City of Aurora Personnel Policies and Procedures, and the Aurora Police Department Directives. While there is little, if any, public interest in investigations stemming from allegations relating to purely administrative matters such as the use of equipment, abuse of leave and the like, these matters are nonetheless provided below.

Further, the City of Aurora also maintains the right to withhold its deliberative process as confidential. The following summaries are included with these privileges of confidentiality in mind. The following summaries do not constitute a waiver of either the individual employee’s expectation of privacy in the contents of his/her personnel file, nor waiver of the City of Aurora’s right to withhold its deliberative process as confidential.

The Department has categorized these 34 cases as follows: Five cases involved members not following Department policies for vehicle operations and/or the Department’s emergency response policy. Two cases involved issues of professional conduct. Two cases involved department equipment. Two cases involved the handling of evidence and/or property. One case involved police – community relations. Nine involved court issues. One case involved request for leave. Seven cases involved unsatisfactory performance. One case involved unintentional discharge of a less lethal weapon. Two cases involved supervisor responsibilities. One involved the utilization of a K9.

The 34 District/Bureau written reprimands involved 33 members and were issued to four recruit officers, 23 officers, one agent, four sergeants, and one lieutenant.

These matters that resulted in written reprimands are summarized with more detail below.

1) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 4.1 Routine Police Vehicle Operations and 4.1.3 Vehicle Operations.
   
   This officer was involved in two preventable motor vehicle accidents within 24 months.

2) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.9.2 Responsibility for Handling or Depositing Evidence and Other Property.

   This officer lost a suspect’s wallet during an arrest and it was never located.
3) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 5.8.15 Unintentional/Negligent Discharge of a Less Lethal Weapon.

This officer unintentionally discharged his department issued Taser.

4) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.4 Police and City Owned Vehicle Collision.

This officer was involved in a preventable accident.

5) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility and 17.5.8 Communication Protocol.

This officer made an inappropriate comment over his radio.

6) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating K9 Standard Operation Procedure 03.01.1 Utilization.

This officer was walking his K9 near his residence when he stopped to speak with a neighbor and his K9 bit the neighbor in the leg.

7) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3.8 Police-Community Relations.

This officer acted in an unprofessional manner with a civilian.

8) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.10.13 Supervisory / Command Review of Reports.

This member failed to properly review a general offense report.

9) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 7.3.2 Firearms Qualification.

This member failed to complete the mandatory 4th quarter firearms qualification.

10) The Department sustained a member for violating Department Directive 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance.

This recruit member failed to complete mandatory assignments as required and failed multiple exams.

11) The Department sustained a member for violating Department Directive 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance.

This recruit member continually had low scores and failures at the academy.

12) The Department sustained a member for violating Department Directive 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance.
This recruit member failed to complete mandatory academy assignments in a timely manner.

13) The Department sustained a member for violating Department Directive 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance.

This recruit member failed three consecutive mandatory tests.

14) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 8.3 Court and 14.3.5 Neglect of Duty.

This officer failed to appear in court which resulted in a second unexcused absence in 4 months.

15) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.3 Court.

This officer failed to appear in court for the second time within a one year period.

16) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 17.13 Accessing Criminal Justice Information Systems.

This sergeant accessed CCIC for personal use.

17) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.2.2 Adherence to Law during Emergency Response.

This member was involved in a preventable traffic accident.

18) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.3 Court.

This member failed to appear for court which resulted in the case being dismissed.

19) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.9.2 Responsibility for Handling Evidence and Other Property.

This officer lost prisoner property.

20) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance.

This member destroyed department property in an effort to retrieve evidence.

21) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 1.4.11 Supervisor Responsibility; Accountability for Performance of Subordinates.

This sergeant conducted an illegal search during a shooting.

22) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.3 Court.

This member failed to appear for court.
23) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.6.5 Use of Departmental Equipment.

This member lost a department issued building pass.

24) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.3 Court and 8.3.3 Member Duties and Responsibilities.

This member failed to appear in court.

25) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.3 Court.

This member failed to appear in court.

26) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.3 Court.

This member failed to appear in court.

27) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.4 Police and City Owned Vehicle Collisions.

This member had 3 preventable accidents within 24 months.

28) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.3.4 Members Appearing Late or Failure to Appear.

This member was late for court.

29) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.4.7 Police and City Owned Vehicle Collisions.

This member had 2 preventable accidents within 24 months.

30) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance and 14.3.8 Police – Community Relations.

This member had an avoidable confrontation with a citizen during a welfare check.

31) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.3 Court.

This member failed to appear in court.

32) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility and 14.3.5 Neglect of Duty.

This member displayed unprofessional conduct and neglected his job functions while assigned to the training academy.

33) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance.
This member failed to properly investigate a case.

34) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.2.3 Request for Leave.

This member went into unpaid leave status without permission from the Chief of Police.
Formal Internal Investigations and Discipline Report

During 2017, the Department completed and finalized 59 formal internal investigations. The following is a summary of the cases resolved in 2017.

Chief Metz and the Aurora Police Department recognize the individual members of the Aurora Police Department have a right to privacy in the contents of their personnel files, including the results of formal investigations and incidents of discipline, and expect the contents of these files will be held in confidence by their employer. This expectation and right to privacy flows from the United States Constitution, the Colorado Constitution, the Colorado Open Records Act, Colorado Revised Statute, § 24-72-201, et. Seq., the Colorado Criminal Justice Records Act, Colorado Revised Statutes § 24-72-301. et. Seq., the City of Aurora Personnel Policies and Procedures, and the Aurora Police Department Directives.

Further, the City of Aurora also maintains the right to withhold its deliberative process as confidential. The following summaries are included below with these privileges of confidentiality in mind. The inclusion of the following summaries does not constitute a waiver of either the individual employee’s expectation of privacy in the contents of his/her personnel files, nor waiver of the City of Aurora’s right to withhold its deliberative process as confidential. In an effort to balance the privacy and confidentiality rights of the individual officers, retaining the deliberative process privilege associated with the decision making detailed below, while at the same time providing our citizens with sufficient information to evaluate the adequacy, thoroughness and impartiality of the Aurora Police Department’s internal investigation and disciplinary process, the following information is provided:

Summary

The Department conducted and resolved 59 formal Internal Affairs investigations in 2017 involving 67 department members. These members consisted of five civilians, two recruits, 43 officers, nine sergeants, six lieutenants, and one captain. (Please note: some employees may be involved in more than one IAB case). The discipline included 23 suspensions without pay, 19 written reprimands, two corrective actions, and one member was fined. Seven members resigned or retired before discipline was issued. One member resigned in lieu of termination. One member was terminated. The Department cleared 22 members of any wrongdoing; either by findings of compliance, exoneration, or they were not sustained.

1) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 8.2.2 Leave Procedures, 8.3 Court, 8.3.3 Member Duties and Responsibilities, 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility, and 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance. The member received Written Reprimand.

   This officer failed to appear for court on two different trial dates and was unprofessional when dealing with an Arapahoe County Victim Witness Specialist.

2) The Department investigated a sworn member involved in a shooting. This is standard practice for any officer involved shooting. Directives reviewed for compliance were 5.1.2 Shooting at or from a moving Vehicle, 5.5.15 Ammunition, 7.3.2 Firearms Qualification, 14.5.8 Critical Incident Drug/Alcohol Testing. The officer was found to be in compliance with all directives reviewed.
Multiple officers responded to an intoxicated party armed with a handgun at a bar. The armed subject failed to comply with multiple orders to drop the gun. This officer fired three rounds from a department issued shotgun. Pellets from the shotgun hit the subject who ran from the area, throwing his handgun. Subject was taken into custody after a short foot pursuit.

3) The Department sustained sworn members for violating Department Directives 14.3.2 Conduct Towards Superior and Subordinate Officers and Associates. Both members received Written Reprimands.

These officers engaged in a brief verbal exchange in front of another officer and an attorney following a critical incident.

4) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.3.5 Neglect of Duty. The member received a 20-hour suspension.

This officer failed to arrive to work for a scheduled shift and did not request prior approval for leave that day and did not notify anyone that they would not be at work.

5) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 6.11.2 Responsibility for Preliminary Investigations, 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance, and 14.3.3 Making a False or Untruthful Declaration. The member resigned prior to any discipline being imposed.

This officer investigated a report of disorderly conduct but failed to complete any follow up.

6) The Department sustained sworn members for violating Department Directives 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance and 1.4.11 Supervisor Responsibility: Accountability for Performance of Subordinates. One member received a Written Reprimand for 1.4.11 and the other member received a 20-hour suspension for 14.3.1.

One member failed to properly investigate and complete three cases between 2013 and 2016. All three cases were filed with the District Attorney, however there were multiple follow up investigations which were not completed. The supervisor of this member failed to properly document the on-going issues.

7) The Department sustained sworn members for violating Department Directives 16.4 Body-worn Cameras. Both members received a Written Reprimand.

Members were investigating allegations of a crime and turned their body worn cameras off while still in contact with the citizens.

8) The Department investigated sworn members for violating Department Directives 5.3 Use of Force, 6.13 Handling Persons with Mental Illness, and 14.2.9 Constitutional Requirements. One member was sustained for 5.3 and received a 40-hour suspension.

This member approached an individual in his home who was acting strange and gave the individual two options; he could either leave the apartment on his own or he would be placed on a mental health hold. The individual refused to leave and this member used unjustified force to take the individual into custody.
9) The Department investigated sworn members for violating Department Directives 5.4.2 Incidents that Require Notification and Reporting, 6.1.2 Release of Adults Arrested without a Warrant, 6.1.10 Release of Handcuffed Persons Following Investigatory Stop, 14.2.9 Constitutional Requirements, and 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance. One member was sustained for 14.2.9 and received a 20-hour suspension.

Officers responded to a family dispute and when they arrived in the area an open garage door with loud noise coming from another residence drew the attention of the officers. The officers made contact with the residents and detained and released two people from the residence without charges. One officer also did not complete an offense report for the use of force used on one resident of the house.

10) The Department investigated two sworn members and one non-sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3.4 Dissemination of Information. One sworn member was sustained and received a Written Reprimand.

Members were accused of sharing confidential information regarding the background check of a former employee.

11) The Department sustained a sworn member of the department for violation Department Directives 6.1 Arrest Procedure, 6.1.10 Release of Handcuffed Persons Following Investigatory Stop, 6.11.2 Responsibility for Preliminary Investigations, 14.2.9 Constitutional Requirements, and 14.3.3 Making a False or Untruthful Statement. The member resigned prior to any discipline being imposed.

This officer responded to a private property accident and contacted the at-fault driver. The officer entered her apartment, without a warrant, and placed her under arrest. The officer took the subject to the patrol car for a brief time before un-cuffing her and releasing her back to her apartment. The officer was interviewed in Internal Affairs about the incident where it was believed that the officer lied during the interview.

12) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 5.1.3 Other Unauthorized Firing of a Weapon. The member received a 10-hour suspension.

Officers conducted a felony traffic stop on a robbery suspect. When exiting the vehicle, the officer unintentionally fired the duty weapon into the air.

13) The Department investigated a sworn member for violation Department Directives 6.6.9 Detainees Property, and 6.11.13 Collection, Preservation, and Use of Physical Evidence. The member was sustained on 6.6.9 and received a Written Reprimand.

After conducting an investigation, the officer failed to maintain custody of evidence taken from the prisoner’s property.

14) The department investigated sworn members for violation of Department Directives 5.1.3 Other Unauthorized Firing of a Weapon and 10.1.1 Notification. One member was sustained for 5.1.3 and received a 10-hour suspension.
Officers responded to a burglary in progress call and while clearing the outside of the residence, this member unintentionally fired his weapon.

15) The Department investigated a sworn member for violation of Department Directive 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility. The member was not sustained.

This case involved a dispute between two members of the department and the subject making unprofessional statements towards the other member.

16) The Department sustained a civilian member for violation of Department Standard Operating Procedures 03.01 Recording/Eavesdropping Policy. Member resigned prior to any discipline being imposed.

During a two month timeframe this member took photographs of the records section on their cellphone.

17) The Department sustained a sworn member for violation of Department Directives 14.1.5 Conformance To Law, 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility, 14.3.5 Neglect of Duty, and 17.2 Use of CAD and MDC. The member resigned before any formal discipline was imposed.

This member engaged in unprofessional activity on and off duty.

18) The Department sustained a sworn member for violation of Department Directives 14.1.5 Conformance to Law, 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility, and 14.3.5 Neglect of Duty. The member resigned in lieu of termination.

This member acted inappropriately on several occasions towards several different women while working on and/or off duty.

19) The Department sustained a sworn member for violation of Department Directive 7.3.2 Firearms Qualification. The member received a Written Reprimand.

Following an Officer Involved Shooting it was discovered that this member had failed to qualify with his firearm.

20) The Department investigated a sworn member for violation of Department Directive 7.2.1 Attendance and 14.3.3 Making a False or Untruthful Declaration. The member was sustained for 7.2.1 and received a Written Reprimand.

Member failed to attend mandatory 2nd quarter in-service.

21) The Department sustained a sworn member for violation of Department Directive 5.1.3 Other Unauthorized Firing of a Weapon. The member received a 10-hour suspension.

While performing a required functions check of the assigned patrol vehicle shotgun, this officer unintentionally discharged a shotgun round into the air.

22) The Department sustained a sworn member for violation of Department Directive 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance. The member received a 12-hour suspension.
This supervisor approved annual leave for two sergeants for the same evening leaving patrol without a first-line supervisor.

23) The Department sustained a sworn member for violation of Department Directives 16.4 Body-Worn Cameras and 17.9 Social Media. The member received a 10-hour suspension.

This member posted a photo of a juvenile that was captured from a personal cell phone from his department issued body camera on a Facebook chat group.

24) The Department investigated a sworn member for violation of Department Directives 4.3 Traffic Enforcement and 16.4 Body-Worn Cameras. The member was sustained on 16.4 and received a Corrective Action.

During a DUI investigation, the member chose to take the driver home instead of arresting for DUI. Additionally, the body-worn camera was turned off prior to completing the contact with the driver.

25) The Department sustained a sworn member for violation of Department Directive 5.1.3 Other Unauthorized Firing of a Weapon. The member received a 10-hour suspension.

While working in an off-duty capacity, this member unintentionally discharged one round from their duty handgun in the bank’s restroom.

26) The Department sustained a sworn member for violation of Department Directive 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance. The member medically retired prior to discipline.

Following this member’s promotion to sergeant, there were numerous complaints of misconduct and poor decision making.

27) The Department sustained a recruit member for violation of Department Directive 14.3.2 Conduct Towards Superior and Subordinate Officers and Associates. The member received a 10-hour suspension.

While attending a lateral recruit academy, this member called another recruit member a derogatory name.

28) The Department investigated a sworn member for violation of Department Directives 14.3.8 Police-Community Relation and 16.4 Body-Worn Cameras. The member was not sustained.

While investigating a motor vehicle accident, another driver attempted to go around the scene of the accident in an attempt to exit the highway. In an effort to get the driver’s attention, this officer allegedly yelled profanities and hit the truck with his fist, causing damage to the vehicle.

29) The Department investigated sworn members for violation of Department Directives 14.1.5 Conformance to Law, 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility, and 10.2.2 Initial Inquiry. One member was sustained for 14.1.5 and 14.3 and received a 60-hour suspension. The other member was sustained on 10.2.2 and received a Written Reprimand.
One member was arrested for being in possession of a firearm while under the influence of alcohol and the other member failed to complete an initial inquiry into the incident in a timely manner.

30) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 5.3 Use of Force. The member received a Written Reprimand.

While assisting school deans with crowd control and attempting to keep the peace between two groups of students, this member advised two aggressive females they needed to leave the campus. Eventually this officer decided to arrest one of the females for her actions but the student walked off. The officer followed in an attempt to stop her and another female stood in his way with clenched fists and physically blocked his path. The officer pushed the female out of the way and continued towards the intended arrestee.

31) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directives 5.3 Use of Force. The member was not sustained.

Officers conducted a traffic stop on a vehicle with occupants who were believed to be involved in a fight with weapons. One occupant ran from the scene and three others were removed from the vehicle. This officer conducted a pat-down search of the driver who refused to comply with the officer’s orders. The driver was taken from a seated position to prone control where he was handcuffed and placed into the patrol car. The driver/arrestee alleged that the officer slammed his head to the ground causing a facial injury.

32) The Department investigated a sworn member for violation of Department Directives 17.9 Social Media and 14.1.5 Conformance to Law. The member was not sustained.

The Department’s PIO Office received an email from FOX 31 News stating they received an anonymous tip claiming the member was using the internet to solicit the tipster’s son.

33) The Department investigated a sworn member for violation of Department Directives 6.9.2 Enforcement Guidelines and 8.10.10 Municipal Application for Arrest Warrant. The member was not sustained.

This member investigated a domestic violence case where the suspect was not on scene. The officer indicated in his General Offense report that he would attempt to locate the suspect and if he failed to do so he would apply for a Municipal warrant. Six years later while researching another case, a supervisor discovered that the suspect in question was never arrested even though the case had been closed as “Warrant Applied For” it did not contain any copies of an application for the warrant or any supplemental reports indicating that a warrant was applied for.

34) The Department sustained a sworn member for violation of Department Directives 14.3.1 Professional Conduct and Responsibility, 14.3.3 Making a False or Untruthful Declaration, and 14.3.8 Police-Community Relations. The member received an 80-hour suspension.

While off-duty and in uniform, this officer allegedly sped by the Comitis Crisis Center in his personal vehicle endangering pedestrians and then flipped off several people which was seen by several witnesses. Initially the officer stated to his supervisor that he did not have a confrontation with anyone in front of Comitis Center and denied flipping anyone off. During the Internal Affairs interview, the officer admitted that he did in fact flip off a person near Comitis.
35) The Department sustained a sworn member for violation of Department Directive 6.11.2 Responsibility for Preliminary Investigations. The member received a 40-hour suspension.

This member responded to a burglary alarm but failed to get out of his patrol vehicle and physically check the premises, and cleared the call as “checked ok, employees on scene”. The business was burglarized and suffered a $68,000 loss. The officer failed to properly investigate the crime.

36) The Department sustained a sworn member for violation of Department Directive 8.2.3 Request for Leave. The member received a Written Reprimand.

Member went into leave without pay status without proper approval of the Chief of Police.

37) The Department investigated sworn members for violation of Department Directives 14.2.9 Constitutional Requirements and 1.4.11 Supervisor Responsibility; Accountability for Performance of Subordinates. One member was sustained for 14.2.9 and received a Written Reprimand.

Officers conducted a traffic stop on a vehicle, ordered the occupants to exit the vehicle and eventually arrested the driver for Failure to Obey. One member then searched the vehicle’s passenger compartment, trunk, and closed containers in both areas. The member stated the search was incident to arrest and stated officers can search for evidence of a crime. Two District Attorneys stated a search in places where firearms could not be concealed was excessive and any evidence located would have been lost in a suppression hearing.

38) The Department sustained a sworn member for violation of Department Directives 6.11.2 Responsibility for Preliminary Investigations and 14.2.9 Constitutional Requirements. The member resigned prior to any discipline being imposed.

The member investigated a cold threat complaint involving a protection order. The call notes indicated the threat was received via email and the RP stated that a no-contact order was in place against her ex-husband, who was aware of the order. The officer found the order in NCIC/CCIC but failed to realize the ex-husband was actually the protected party. The officer submitted warrant paperwork, based on the email threat, for the arrest of the ex-husband who was later arrested and jailed.

39) The Department sustained a sworn member for violation of Department Directive 4.6.5 Use of Departmental Equipment. The member received a fine of $318.

This officer took off his body camera and placed it on the back of his patrol vehicle. The officer was later dispatched to a call and drove off with the camera still on the patrol car. The camera fell off and was later recovered but was badly damaged.

40) The Department investigated sworn members for violation of Department Directives 10.2.14 Supervisor Responsibility, 10.1.1 Notification, 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility, and 4.2.9 Pursuit Guidelines. One member was sustained for 10.2.14 and received a Written Reprimand. Two members were sustained for 14.3 and received Written Reprimands.
Members were involved in a pursuit. After the pursuit ended, one member was attempting to take pictures of the suspect who refused and would not comply with the officers. One member grabbed the suspect’s forehead and lifted his head up for a photograph and another member held the suspect’s neck/chin area to assist with the photograph being taken. The supervisor on scene directed the officers to hold the suspect’s head so he could take a picture.

41) The Department sustained a civilian member for violation of Department Directive 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance, 14.3.2 Conduct Towards Superior and Subordinate Officers and Associates, 14.3.3 Making a False or Untruthful Declaration, and 14.3.5 Neglect of Duty. The member resigned prior to discipline being imposed.

During the course of approximately four years, this civilian member displayed a pattern of poor work performance. The member also was disrespectful to her direct supervisor which was witnessed by other employees. It is alleged that the member lied to her supervisor during an initial inquiry into possible violations of City Owned Computers Policy.

42) The Department investigated sworn members for violation of Department Directives 14.3.1 Professional Conduct and Responsibility and 10.2.14 Supervisor Responsibility. One member was sustained for 14.3.1 and was terminated.

Officers were investigating a Denver PD pursuit and officer-involved shooting in Aurora. Following the pursuit and the shooting a large crowd had gathered at the scene. After the scene was secure, two members engaged in a conversation, captured on body-worn camera where one member made a racial slur and the other member immediately turned off his body camera and failed to immediately notify anyone of the incident.

43) The Department sustained a sworn member for violation of Department Directive 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance. The member received a Written Reprimand.

This member failed to make the proper notifications following a critical incident.

44) The Department investigated a civilian member for violation of Department Directive 14.3.3 Making a False or Untruthful Declaration and SOP PRP 304 2.6 Disposition of Evidence, Confiscated or Found Property. The member was sustained on SOP 304 2.6 and received a 100-hour suspension.

While working at the property warehouse the member did not follow policies or procedures and destroyed a diagnostic computer as found property, when it had actually been reported stolen. The member also stated to his supervisor that he did not see the item had a serial number until it was destroyed, but the video from the warehouse contradicted the statements.

45) The Department sustained a sworn member for violation of Department Directive 5.1.3 Other Unauthorized Firing of a Weapon. The member received a 10-hour suspension.

While clearing a building on a burglary alarm, the officer noticed that the weapon’s mounted light switch was malfunctioning. After the search of the building, the officer attempted to determine the cause for the malfunction. As the officer attempted to remove the light assembly, he unintentionally discharged a round from his firearm.
46) The Department sustained a sworn member for violation of Department Directive 8.3 *Court*. The member received a Corrective Action.

This officer failed to appear for court on three separate occasions during the same year.

47) The Department investigated sworn members for violation of Department Directives 4.1.3 *Vehicle Operation*, 4.4.3 *On-Scene Supervisor Responsibility*, and 14.3.3 *Making a False or Untruthful Declaration*. The members were not sustained.

While responding to a call involving street racers, one officer hit another vehicle and the vehicle fled from the scene. The officer informed his supervisor as to what happened and explained to his supervisor that he was attempting to block the vehicle from leaving. The written statements of the officer and his supervisor conflicted with the information heard on the body cameras.

48) The Department sustained a sworn member for violation of Department Directive 5.1.3 *Other Unauthorized Firing of a Weapon*. The member received a 10-hour suspension.

While off-duty and at home, this member unintentionally discharged a round from his firearm while showing his wife what he had learned in the academy.

49) The Department sustained a sworn member for violation of Department Directive 4.1.3 *Vehicle Operation*. The member received a 10-hour suspension.

This member was involved in three motor vehicle accidents in less than 24 months.

50) The Department investigated a sworn member for violation of Department Directives 14.1.5 *Conformance to Law*, 17.1.1 *Authorized Use of City Computers, Associated Devices, and City-Owned Networks*, and 17.2 *Use of Cad and MDC*. The member was not sustained.

Officers arrested a person who was wanted and known to be working at a retail store in Aurora. One of the officers’ girlfriends worked at the store. The RP/arrestee alleged the officer inappropriately collected information about her in order to personally advance his girlfriend.

51) The Department sustained a sworn member for violation of Department Directive 17.9.5 *Personal Use*. The member received a Written Reprimand.

The Chief of Police sent out a Tweet encouraging the Transgender community to apply for positions with the police department. After the Tweet, a retired APD Officer made a post on his Facebook page regarding the Chief’s Tweet. This member commented on the post, which offended a City Council Member.

52) The Department investigated a sworn member for violation of Department Directives 14.3 *Professional Conduct and Responsibility* and 14.3.1 *Unsatisfactory Performance*. The member was not sustained.

This member was assisting a Program Director with the City on a project. The Program Director reported that the member was not following up on project tasks as assigned. The member met with the Program Director to discuss issues regarding the project and instead of discussing those, the member talked about his personal life and made disparaging remarks about the Chief.
53) The Department investigated a sworn member for violation of Department Directives 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility and 14.3.4 Dissemination of Information. The member was sustained on 14.3 and received a Written Reprimand.

A presentation regarding the APA was given to the Lateral Recruit class and during the presentation this member made disparaging comments about another member of APD.

54) The Department investigated a civilian member for violation of Department Directives 14.3.7 Leave, Illness, and Injury. The member was not sustained.

This employee attended a required training class however she left early as she was feeling ill. Later that same night, she posted pictures on social media showing she was at a casino in Blackhawk.

55) The Department sustained a sworn member for violation of Department Directive 8.3 Court. The member received a 10-hour suspension.

This officer failed to appear for court on three separate occasions during the same year.

56) The Department investigated a sworn member for violation of Department Directive 6.11.2 Responsibility for Preliminary Investigations and 14.3.3 Making a False or Untruthful Declaration. The member was sustained on 6.11.2 and received a 40-hour suspension.

While taking a report of a return runaway, statements were made to the officer that the juvenile may have been sexually assaulted. The officer failed to document the alleged sexual assault and took no further action when the mother of the juvenile stated she would be taking her daughter to the hospital for a sex assault examination.

57) The Department sustained a sworn member for violation of Department Directive 6.11.2 Responsibility for Preliminary Investigations and 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance. The member received a 20-hour suspension.

Officers responded to a department store reference a shoplifter in custody. This officer contacted the suspect who was found to be in possession of a jar of methamphetamine. The officer interviewed the suspect about the narcotics and believed she was not a user of methamphetamine and she only had the narcotics in her possession because her boyfriend put them in her purse. The officer seized the narcotics and issued the suspect a municipal summons for theft and released her on scene. A detective later filed possession of narcotics charges.

58) The Department sustained a sworn member for violation of Department Directive 5.1.3 Other Unauthorized Firing of a Weapon. The member received a 10-hour suspension.

While investigating a possible residential burglary, the officer noticed a garage door was partially up and a small window next to the front door was broken out. The officer transferred his weapon to his left hand so he could reach in and open the door with his right hand. As the officer reached in the window, he unintentionally fired a round from his firearm.
59) The Department sustained a sworn member for violation of Department Directive 14.1.5 Conformance to Law. The member received a 240-hour suspension.

Member was arrested for DUI while off-duty.
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Introduction

In conjunction with our core values of integrity, honor and duty, the Aurora Police Department strives for professionalism in the performance of our duties. We encourage positive behavior in our employees by the use of awards and commendations. We also encourage our employees and citizens to report any perceived misconduct by our officers. We investigate every complaint and concern reported to the Department and take appropriate action, protecting the rights of the citizen and the Department member. This report reflects our commitment to openness and transparency to the community we serve.

The Department has four methods to manage complaints and discipline. The four methods used to manage complaints and disciplines are: the Automated Complaint and Commendation System; District / Bureau Discipline; Negotiated Disciplinary Settlement Agreement Process; and Formal Internal Investigations and Discipline.

Automated Complaint and Commendation System

The Aurora Police Department created the Automated Complaint and Commendation System in 2006 to manage and record all allegations and investigations of complaints and commendations received on sworn officers of the Department. Regardless of how received, all complaints and commendations are entered into the automated system.

Citizens can enter their complaint or commendation directly online through the City’s website. If the Department receives a complaint or commendation in person, on the telephone or in writing, the receiving employee enters the information into the system. Once entered in the automated system, the complaint is forwarded to the Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB) Commanding Officer. Once the Internal Affairs Commanding Officer or designee has reviewed the case, if he or she determines the case in an allegation that can be investigated at the District / Bureau level, he or she will send the case to the appropriate Commanding Officer. The Commanding Officer will assign the case to an appropriate supervisor in the District / Bureau and a preliminary investigation will be completed. If during the preliminary investigation, the investigator believes the allegation should not be handled at the District / Bureau level, a request for investigation by the IAB will be completed and forwarded, through the complaint management system to the subject member’s Division Chief.

Safeguards built into the system include the following: no one can delete the complaint or commendation; only one supervisor can work on the complaint at a time (following the chain of command); supervisors can add information but cannot remove it; all information inserted into the system is saved, documenting the date and time submitted and by whom; supervisors can search the system to determine if the officer has similar complaints and or commendations.

The system records all of the information and produces statistical information. Police managers use the information to determine future training needs as well as to decide an appropriate level of discipline.

District/Bureau Discipline

Cases that result in corrective measures (training verses discipline) are recorded in the Automated Complaint and Commendation System. A Police Department Supervisor or Manager investigates all District / Bureau Discipline cases. He/she obtains all the necessary information and reports his/her
findings to his/her supervisor. The employee’s chain of command reviews the investigation. If any supervisor in the chain of command determines that the employee violated a Department Directive(s) and decides the appropriate level of discipline is a Written Reprimand, he/she makes that recommendation to the Chief of Police or his designee. If the Chief concurs with the findings, a Written Reprimand is prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Chief. The Chief of Police may personally issue and serve the Written Reprimand on the employee or delegate this duty to a command officer within the employee’s chain of command. The Written Reprimand is part of the employee’s permanent discipline file.

**Negotiated Disciplinary Settlement Agreement Process**

When an internal or external complaint is entered into the automated complaint system, it is immediately routed to IAB for review. The IAB Commander or designee will review the complaint to determine if it should be assigned to IAB for a full IAB investigation or reassigned to the subject member’s Commander for either Preliminary Investigation or an NDSA (Negotiated Disciplinary Settlement Agreement). The IAB Commander or designees will add notes to the automated complaint system indicating the matter is eligible for the NDSA process. The tracking note will include a range of discipline based on the comparable discipline for prior similar policy violations resulting in a 40-hour suspension or less. The purpose of the NDSA process is to provide efficient resolution of Departmental Directives violations requiring limited formal discipline without the necessity of a formal Internal Affairs investigation.

**Formal Internal Investigations and Discipline**

The Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB) Commanding Officer or designee receives allegations of misconduct. The IAB Commanding Officer determines whether the allegation of misconduct necessitates an IAB investigation. The IAB has the authority of the Chief of Police to conduct investigations. The IAB completes the investigation and will notify the subject member/members’ Division Chief(s), and District / Bureau Commander Officer(s) that the case is available for review. Once the involved Chiefs and Commanding Officers have read the case, the Deputy Chief, on behalf of the Chief of Police, will convene a Chief’s Review Board (CRB). The CRB will review the case and discuss the recommendation of finding from the IAB Commander. If the CRB determines a finding of sustained for any allegation of misconduct, or noncompliance for any compliance review, the CRB will make a recommendation of discipline to the Chief of Police. The Chief of Police will inform the member of recommended discipline. Additionally, critical incidents (i.e. police shootings, use of force resulting in serious injuries or death, serious traffic accidents involving officers, etc.) may result in a formal investigation regardless of whether there is any evidence or accusation of misconduct.
Perspective Statistics

The Department provides the following statistical information for the purpose of perspective. The Department currently employs 711 sworn officers, 136.5 civilian employees, and 69 public safety communication employees (total 916.5). During 2018, the Department handled 236,646 calls for service from the public, arrested 10,218 suspects, issued 5,909 criminal summonses (non-custodial arrests) and issued 33,413 traffic citations (this excludes parking tickets and General Offense related traffic summonses).

As noted in detail in the following sections, the Department received a total of 511 complaints for sworn members, 8 complaints for non-sworn members, 52 commendations for sworn members and one commendation for a non-sworn member.
Automated Complaint and Commendation Report

The Automated Complaint and Commendation System accepts and records all submissions. The Department designed the system to manage the complaints and commendations reported on sworn personnel.

During 2018, there were 519 complaints received online or entered by a Police Department member that involved 511 sworn members and eight non-sworn members. (Please note: some complaints may include several officers).

Additionally, 52 commendations were received for sworn officers. There was one commendation submitted for non-sworn members of the Department.

2018 Automated Complaints and Commendations

- Sworn Complaints (511)
- Non-Sworn Complaints (8)
- Sworn Commendations (52)
Automated Complaints by Type

The Automated Complaint System categorizes the submissions for the Department to analyze, determine trends and provide instruction if needed.

The system categorized the complaints received during 2018 as follows: One allegation of an illegal search, no reports of neglect of duty, 69 reported violations of court issues or missed court, four reported violations of Constitutional rights, four allegations of unsatisfactory performance, 12 allegations of racial profiling, 20 reports of excessive use of force, 34 complaints of improper or incomplete investigations, 113 for other directives or standard operation procedures not captured under the other types and 115 complaints of rudeness or professionalism issues.

Complaints by Event Type

- Illegal Search (1)
- Neglect of Duty (0)
- Constitutional Requirements (4)
- Unstatisfactory Performance (44)
- Bias-based Profiling (12)
- Use of Force (20)
- Improper/Incomplete Investigation (34)
- Other Dept. Directive or SOP (113)
- Officer Professionalism (115)
- Court Issue (69)
Automated Complaints by Validity

In each of the complaint submissions received, the officer’s supervisor has investigated the complaint. The officer’s chain of command has reviewed the investigations before closing them.

The Department has reviewed each of the complaints and ascertained the validity of the complaint. From these there were 187 sustained, 174 not sustained, 109 unfounded, 41 within policy, no misunderstandings, and none with an unresponsive complainant.
Automated Complaints, Results

The Automated Complaint System records any corrective action taken by the Department as a result of the investigation. The results range from “none justified” to an order by the Chief for the Internal Affairs Bureau to formally investigate the complaint. Careful study and comparison of this information will reveal that more incidents result in some form of correction than incidents that are found to be valid. This is because the complaint may not be valid in light of the Department Directives, but the supervisor may determine the officer needs some degree of instruction to help him/her do a better job.

The results of the complaints submitted are as follows, in descending order of severity. The Chief of Police ordered the Internal Affairs Bureau to formally investigate 67 members (see page 20 for results of formal investigations). The Department sent six cases through the Negotiated Disciplinary Settlement Agreement (NDSA) process. The Department issued 23 Written Reprimands for violations of Department Directives. A Written Reprimand is permanent discipline that remains in the officer’s file for his/her entire career. The Department issued nine Corrective Action Reports instructing the officers to change their behavior. The Corrective Action Report is not discipline but a notice or warning to modify behavior. The Corrective Action Report remains in the officer’s file for one to two years, depending on his/her evaluation date and cycle. It is documentation of past problems and corrective measures taken to correct the behavior. The officer’s supervisors issued 61 Performance Appraisal Entry (PAE) reports documenting negative performance. The supervisors use the PAE reports as documentation to be included in the officers’ annual evaluations. On 30 occasions, the supervisors verbally counseled the officers. One complaint was referred to mediation. The supervisors completed 12 Performance Appraisal Entry reports that were to document the investigation only (nothing negative toward the officer). The Department concluded in 296 of the complaints that the complaint was not valid, and that no documentation was needed.
Automated Complaints, Follow Up Contact Method

At the conclusion of the investigation the supervisor is required, if possible, to contact the complainant and explain the findings. The Automated Complaint System records show the supervisor contacted that person.

The supervisors contacted the complainant by telephone in 105 of the cases. The supervisors used e-mail 125 times. In 78 cases, the supervisor could not contact the complainant (anonymous complaint or attempted but unable to contact). The supervisor met the complainant in person 65 times.
Automated Commendations by Type

The system categorized the 52 commendations received during 2018 as follows:

12 citizen submissions expressed appreciation for the officer. Two others reported a job well done. Four submissions stated the officer was professional. Two reported the officer went above and beyond expectations and 32 expressed a thank you.

Automated Commendations by Type

- Appreciation (12) - 23%
- Job Well Done (2) - 4%
- Professionalism (4) - 8%
- Above and Beyond (2) - 4%
- Thank You (32) - 61%
Automated Complaint and Commendation System,
Miscellaneous Information on People Reporting

The automated complaint and commendation system allows the submitting person the opportunity to provide information about himself/herself. The system has a drop-down menu giving the person a choice of options to describe himself/herself. 98 of the people submitting a complaint or commendation indicated they were a citizen of Aurora. 53 indicated they were a non-resident. 46 said they were an employee member of the Department, and 73 indicated they were a government official.

Type of People Submitting Commendations and Complaints

- Resident (36%)
- Non-Resident (27%)
- Member (20%)
- City Official (17%)
**Gender of People**

Submitting Commendations and Complaints

- Male (155) - 42%
- Female (159) - 43%
- Unknown Gender (58) - 15%

**Reported Ethnicity of People**

Submitting Commendations and Complaints

- White (192) - 52%
- African American (66) - 26%
- Latino (16) - 4%
- Asian (1) - 0%
- American Indian (0) - >1%
- Arab (0) - >1%
- Unknown (96) - 18%
District and Bureau Discipline Report

Chief Metz and the Aurora Police Department recognize members of the Aurora Police Department have a right to privacy in the contents of their personnel files and expect the contents of these files will be held in confidence by their employer. This expectation and right to privacy flows from the United States Constitution, the Colorado Constitution, the Colorado Open Records Act, Colorado Revised Statutes § 24-72-201, et. seq., the Colorado Criminal Justice Records Act, Colorado Revised Statutes, § 24-72-301, et. seq., the City of Aurora Personnel Policies and Procedures, and the Aurora Police Department Directives. While there is little, if any, public interest in investigations stemming from allegations relating to purely administrative matters such as the use of equipment, abuse of leave and the like, these matters are nonetheless provided below.

Further, the City of Aurora also maintains the right to withhold its deliberative process as confidential. The following summaries are included with these privileges of confidentiality in mind. The following summaries do not constitute a waiver of either the individual employee’s expectation of privacy in the contents of his/her personnel file, nor waiver of the City of Aurora’s right to withhold its deliberative process as confidential.

During 2018, the Department completed and finalized 30 District / Bureau investigations. Each resulted in the Chief of Police ordering a Written Reprimand as discipline for the violation of one or more Department Directives. A Written Reprimand is permanent discipline that remains in the employee’s file for his/her career.

The Department has categorized these 30 cases as follows: Six cases involved members not following Department policies for vehicle operations and/or the Department’s emergency response policy. One case involved issues of professional conduct. Two cases involved department equipment. Three cases involved the handling of evidence and/or property. Eight involved court issues. One case involved request for leave. Seven cases involved unsatisfactory performance. One case involved supervisor responsibilities. One case involved body worn camera operation.

The 30 District/Bureau written reprimands involved 28 members and were issued to one civilian, three recruit officers, 21 officers, one agent, one sergeants, and one lieutenant.

These matters that resulted in written reprimands are summarized with more detail below.

1) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility.

While working off duty, this member was involved in an accident on the property of another off-duty job.

2) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.9.2 Responsibility for Handling or Depositing Evidence and Other Property.

This officer collected the property of an arrestee and after transporting the prisoner it was realized the property bag was missing and never located.
3) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.9.2 Responsibility for Handling or Depositing Evidence and Other Property.

While making an arrest of a suspect, this officer removed personal property from the arrestee and placed it on the hood of the patrol vehicle. Prior to leaving the scene for the jail, the property was not retained and secured and was lost.

4) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.1.3 Vehicle Operation.

This member received a second photo red light violation.

5) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance.

This member failed to satisfactorily complete a report on a curfew violation and had multiple errors on the forms associated with the report.

6) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.10.13 Supervisory/Command Review of Reports.

An arrest was made on a juvenile subject which members of investigations later learned lacked probable cause for an arrest. This supervisory member approved the warrantless arrest application.

7) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.9.2 Responsibility for Handling or Depositing Evidence and Other Property.

Following the arrest of a suspect, this officer placed personal property from the arrestee on the hood of the patrol vehicle. The arrestee was then transported but the member failed to retrieve the property from the hood of the vehicle and the property was never located.

8) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 8.10 Reports, 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance and 14.2.9 Constitutional Requirements.

Officers were dispatched on a report of a disorderly party who was highly intoxicated. The reporting party did not want to pursue any charges, so officers provided a courtesy transport from the location. The subject later became argumentative and combative and was physically arrested and jailed for trespassing despite the reporting party’s request.

9) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance.

This recruit member failed three geography tests.

10) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance.

This recruit member failed three geography tests.
11) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.2.8 Authorized Use of Police Pursuits.

Member pursued a stolen vehicle against department policy.

12) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.3 Court.

Member failed to appear for a DOR hearing resulting in the case being dismissed.

13) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.3 Court.

Member failed to appear for court.

14) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance.

This recruit member failed three geography tests.

15) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.3 Court.

Member failed to appear for court.

16) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.3 Court.

Member failed to appear for court.

17) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.3 Court.

Member failed to appear for court.

18) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.1.3 Vehicle Operation.

This officer was involved in a preventable traffic accident.

19) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.3 Court.

Member failed to appear for court.

20) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance.

Agent did not provide discovery to the District Attorney’s Office in a timely manner.

21) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.3 Court.

Member failed to appear for court.

22) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.1.3 Vehicle Operation.
This officer was involved in a preventable traffic accident.

23) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 16.4 Body Worn Camera Operation.

Member failed to activate their department issued body worn camera during a pursuit.

24) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 8.10 Reports, 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance and 14.2.9 Constitutional Requirements.

Officers were dispatched on a report of a disorderly party who was highly intoxicated. The reporting party did not want to pursue any charges, so officers provided a courtesy transport from the location. The subject later became argumentative and combative and was physically arrested and jailed for trespassing despite the reporting party’s request.

25) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.3 Court.

Member failed to appear for court.

26) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.6.5 Use of Departmental Equipment.

Member lost their wallet containing their department issued ID card.

27) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.6.5 Use of Departmental Equipment.

Member lost their wallet containing their department issued ID card.

28) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.1.3 Vehicle Operation.

This officer was involved in a preventable traffic accident.

29) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 8.2.1 Scheduled Leave, 8.2.3 Request for Leave, APD SOP 1.1.1 Reporting for Duty, and APD SOP 14.1 Leave Requests/Trade Days.

This member failed to contact supervisors for approval for leave time or deviation from their work schedule.

30) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.2 Emergency Response and Police Vehicle Pursuits.

While attempting to stop a vehicle for speeding, this member traveled at unsafe speeds and later crashed into another vehicle.
Negotiated Disciplinary Settlement Agreement

Chief Metz and the Aurora Police Department recognize members of the Aurora Police Department have a right to privacy in the contents of their personnel files and expect the contents of these files will be held in confidence by their employer. This expectation and right to privacy flows from the United States Constitution, the Colorado Constitution, the Colorado Open Records Act, Colorado Revised Statutes § 24-72-201, et. seq., the Colorado Criminal Justice Records Act, Colorado Revised Statutes, § 24-72-301, et seq., the City of Aurora Personnel Policies and Procedures, and the Aurora Police Department Directives. While there is little, if any, public interest in investigations stemming from allegations relating to purely administrative matters such as the use of equipment, abuse of leave and the like, these matters are nonetheless provided below.

Further, the City of Aurora also maintains the right to withhold its deliberative process as confidential. The following summaries are included with these privileges of confidentiality in mind. The following summaries do not constitute a waiver of either the individual employee’s expectation of privacy in the contents of his/her personnel file, nor waiver of the City of Aurora’s right to withhold its deliberative process as confidential.

During 2018, the Department completed and finalized six Negotiated Disciplinary Settlement Agreements. Each resulted in the Chief of Police ordering a Written Reprimand or a suspension as discipline for the violation of one or more Department Directives.

The Department has categorized these six cases as follows: One case involved issues of professional conduct. One cases involved department equipment. Two cases involved unauthorized firing of a weapon. One involved court issues. One case involved preliminary investigations.

The six Negotiated Disciplinary Settlement Agreements cases involved six members and were issued to 3 officers, two agents, and one sergeant.

1) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.3.3 Member Duties and Responsibilities. The member received a 10-hour suspension.

Member arrived late to court.

2) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility. The member received a 20-hour suspension.

This member was found to have used derogatory language towards an arrestee.

3) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.6 Issuance of Equipment, Badges and ID Card. The member received a Written Reprimand.

Member lost his department issued ID card and building pass.

4) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 6.11 Preliminary Investigation. The member received a 30-hour suspension.
Member failed to adequately investigate a harassment/Domestic Violence complaint.

5) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 5.1.3 Other Unauthorized Firing of a Weapon. The member received a 20-hour suspension.

Member accidentally fired a weapon in the armory.

6) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 5.1.3 Other Unauthorized Firing of a Weapon. The member received a 20-hour suspension.

Member accidentally fired his weapon while at his residence.
Formal Internal Investigations and Discipline Report

Chief Metz and the Aurora Police Department recognize the individual members of the Aurora Police Department have a right to privacy in the contents of their personnel files, including the results of formal investigations and incidents of discipline, and expect the contents of these files will be held in confidence by their employer. This expectation and right to privacy flows from the United States Constitution, the Colorado Constitution, the Colorado Open Records Act, Colorado Revised Statute, § 24-72-201, et. Seq., the Colorado Criminal Justice Records Act, Colorado Revised Statutes § 24-72-301. et. Seq., the City of Aurora Personnel Policies and Procedures, and the Aurora Police Department Directives.

Further, the City of Aurora also maintains the right to withhold its deliberative process as confidential. The following summaries are included below with these privileges of confidentiality in mind. The inclusion of the following summaries does not constitute a waiver of either the individual employee’s expectation of privacy in the contents of his/her personnel files, nor waiver of the City of Aurora’s right to withhold its deliberative process as confidential. In an effort to balance the privacy and confidentiality rights of the individual officers, retaining the deliberative process privilege associated with the decision making detailed below, while at the same time providing our citizens with sufficient information to evaluate the adequacy, thoroughness and impartiality of the Aurora Police Department’s internal investigation and disciplinary process, the following information is provided:

Summary

The Department conducted and resolved 38 formal Internal Affairs investigations in 2018 involving 59 department members. (Please note: some investigations were initiated in prior years however, were not resolved until 2018). The members consisted of two civilians, one recruit, 43 officers, seven sergeants, one sergeant major, and three lieutenants. (Please note: some employees may be involved in more than one IAB case). The discipline included 20 suspensions without pay, 15 written reprimands, and seven corrective actions and one negative PAE. Two members resigned or retired before discipline was issued. One member was terminated. The Department cleared 11 members of any wrongdoing.

1) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.1.1 Lawful Orders, 14.2.3 Associations, 14.2.4 Interventions, 14.3.5 Neglect of Duty, 17.2 Use of CAD and MDC, 14.1.5 Conformance to Law, and 14.3.3 Making a False or Untruthful Declaration. The member was terminated. 

This member engaged in criminal activity and associated with known felons.

2) The Department investigated sworn members for violating Department Directives 8.10.9 Warrantless Arrest Affidavits, 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance and 14.3.3 Making a False or Untruthful Declaration. One member was sustained on 8.10.9 and received a 12-hour suspension and one member was sustained on 14.3.1 and received a 20-hour suspension.

Officers responded to robbery with shots fired where two arrests were made. Two warrantless arrest affidavits were completed but did not contain the required information to establish probable cause. The affidavits also did not contain other required information, such as victim
names. One supervisor approved the warrantless affidavits. The DA’s office dismissed the charges against both suspects.

3) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 8.2.3 Request for Leave, 14.1.5 Conformance to Law, 14.1.7 Conduct Involving Moral Turpitude, 14.3.3 Making a False or Untruthful Declaration, and 14.3.5 Neglect of Duty. The member retired prior to discipline.

While assigned to an external task force, this member did not work the required number of hours per work. The member untruthfully submitted requests for overtime when they were not working and neglected their duties.

4) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3.8 Police-Community Relations. The member received a Written Reprimand.

While working off-duty, this member was enforcing the rules of the condominium complex rather than enforcing the law. The member was overbearing and aggressive during the contact with the parties on scene.

5) The Department investigated sworn members for violating Department Directives 5.3 Use of Physical Force and 14.3.3 Making a False or Untruthful Declaration. One member was sustained on 5.3 but retired prior to discipline.

Officers became involved in a shooting investigation and contacted the victim and associated parties at a medical facility. A decision was made to impound a vehicle for evidentiary purposes and during this process the female driver of the vehicle refused to provide the keys to the vehicle. One officer attempted to place the female under arrest, resulting in a struggle. Officers attempted to gain control of the female by taking her to the ground where she was accidentally kicked in the head.

6) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.1.5 Conformance to Law, 14.2.4 Interventions and 14.3.3 Making a False or Untruthful Declaration. The member was sustained on 14.1.5 and received a 160-hour suspension.

Officer was charged criminally in Boulder County. The charges stemmed from the officer’s interactions with the Erie Police Department regarding a felony menacing case involving his nephew. Officer pled guilty to a reduced charge.

7) The Department investigated sworn members for violating Department Directives 6.9.1 Domestic Violence – Enforcement Guidelines, 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance and 14.3.10 Reporting Responsibility. One member was sustained on 6.9.10 and 14.3.10 and received a 20-hour suspension.

Officers responded to a Domestic Violence call where the officers reported that the victim stated there was not a physical altercation however several items of clothing were torn, and the victim stated to the City Attorney that she did tell the officers her husband had been physical and attempted to rape her. These statements the victim made were captured on the officer’s body cameras.
8) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directives 7.1.2 Required Training, 7.2.5 Attendance of In-Service, 8.2.3 Request for Leave, 14.1.1 Lawful Orders, and 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance. The member was sustained on 7.1.2, 7.2.5, 8.2.3, and 14.1.1. The member received a 20-hour suspension.

Officer failed to attend a full day of a make-up in-service and did not notify a supervisor.

9) The Department investigated sworn members for violating Department Directives 14.2.9 Constitutional Requirements, 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance and 16.4.3 Body Worn Camera Operation. One member was sustained on 14.3.1 and 16.4.3 and one member was sustained for 14.3.1. Both members received a Written Reprimand.

Sergeant and Officer were dispatched to a welfare check. The officers made entry into the residence through an unlocked front door without being invited in and without exigency. They talked to a resident through a closed door and left the scene without making face to face contact and without searching the residence.

10) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directives 6.11.2 Responsibility for Preliminary Investigations, 8.10.3 General Offense Reports and 16.4.3 Body Worn Camera Operation. The member was sustained on 6.11.2 and 16.4.3 and received a 20-hour suspension.

Officer was working as a SRO when he was called to the school counseling office for a suicidal student where he contacted the subject and her mother. During his interaction, the student and her mother told the officer that she had been sexually assaulted by another student. The officer did not complete a report detailing the sexual assault allegation and he did not activate his body camera during the encounter.

11) The Department investigated a civilian member for violating 1.5 Professionalism and Conflicts and 1.6 Disciplinary Action Policy from the City of Aurora Employee Manual. The member was not sustained.

While attending a party after hours and off-duty, this member purchased shots of alcohol for other employees. The member also directed another employee to call in sick before purchasing more alcohol. Later that week, while on-duty this member showed other employees pictures of an intoxicated employee from that night.

12) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directives 8.9.2 Responsibility for Handling or Depositing Evidence and Other Property, 8.10.4 Supplemental Reports, 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility and 16.4.5 Body Worn Camera Operation. The member was sustained on 8.9.2, 8.10.4 and 16.4.5 and received a 10-hour suspension.

Officer assisted with a robbery investigation and found a $100 bill in the street and picked the bill up and kept it for himself and did not enter the recovered bill into property as either evidence or found property.

13) The Department investigated sworn members for violating Department Directives 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance, 14.3.10 Reporting Responsibility and 1.4.11 Supervisor Responsibility: Accountability for Performance of Subordinates. One member was sustained on 14.3.10 and received a Written Reprimand.
Agent was assigned a forgery/counterfeit case in which he conducted follow-up on the case but did not document the follow-up information in a supplement report and later requested a no-file from the DA without providing follow-up information. The Sergeant approved the Agent’s reports.

14) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility. The member received a Written Reprimand.

Officer made statements to other members of APD alleging that a lieutenant was driving under the influence of alcohol and another lieutenant covered it up. Officer also made unsubstantiated statements that the same lieutenant would come to work drunk.

15) The Department investigated sworn members for violating Department Directives 8.3.5 Procedures for Requesting Continuances and Dismissals and 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance. All members were sustained on 14.3.1 and received Written Reprimands.

Officers responded to the Aurora Municipal Courts to testify on a Domestic Violence case and it is alleged that the officers encouraged the court staff to dismiss the charges against the defendant on the day of trial.

16) The Department investigated sworn members for violating Department Directives 6.11.2 Responsibility for Preliminary Investigations and 6.1.2 Release of Adults Arrested without a Warrant. One officer was sustained on 6.11.2 and one supervisor was sustained on 6.1.2. Both members received a Written Reprimand.

All three officers were dispatched to a Domestic Violence investigation which was not properly documented. The male half on the call was arrested for Possession of a Weapon by a Previous Offender, however his prior felony conviction was not valid.

17) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 6.11.2 Responsibility for Preliminary Investigations and 16.4.5 Body Worn Camera Operation. The member received a 40-hour suspension.

Officer did not conduct a preliminary investigation involving possible abuse of a non-verbal autistic child by a staff member at an elementary school.

18) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directives 4.2.1 Authorized Emergency Response and 14.3.3 Making a False or Untruthful Declaration. The member was sustained on 4.2.1 and received a 20-hour suspension.

It is alleged that Officer was untruthful during an EEO investigation involving his recruit. In addition, while on duty and without authorization, the Officer drove his recruit to the hospital outside of his assigned district to visit her mother with emergency lights and siren activated.

19) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 8.12.3 Requirements/Limitations of Sworn Members Engaged in Secondary Employment and 14.3.5 Neglect of Duty. The member received a Written Reprimand.
While working at an off-duty job, the owner of the business observed this Officer allegedly sleeping in his vehicle.

20) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance. The member received a 40-hour suspension.

Recruit Officer was alleged to have cheated during an academy exam.

21) The Department investigated sworn members for violating Department Directives 16.4.9 Body Worn Camera Member Responsibility and 16.4.10 Body Worn Camera Retention, Storage and Duplication. Two members were sustained on the allegations and both members received a 10-hour suspension.

An Officer made a traffic stop on the son of an elected official. The son was belligerent and argumentative. This officer showed the body-cam footage to fellow officers. Another officer recorded the video with his cell phone and showed the clip to yet another officer who in turn showed it to her husband, who was not a department member. The cellphone video was eventually leaked to the media without the approval of the Chief’s Office.

22) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility and 14.3.3 Making a False or Untruthful Declaration. The member was sustained on 14.3 and received a Written Reprimand.

Officer investigated a possible drunk driver where he arrested the driver for DUI. The defendant alleged that the Officer lied during the DOR hearing. The officer did not adequately prepare for the DOR hearing.

23) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 5.1.3 Other Unauthorized Firing of a Weapon. The member received a 10-hour suspension.

Officer unintentionally discharged his duty weapon while in a foot pursuit of a burglary subject.

24) The Department investigated sworn members for violating Department Directives 6.1.13 Search Incident to Arrest, 6.5.1 Searching Detainees before Transport and 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance. All three members were sustained on 14.3.1 and received a Corrective Action.

Officers responded to a report of a physical altercation where they took a subject into custody for an active warrant. All three officers searched the subject however did not find a small pistol that was concealed in his sock. The gun was found by a detention officer.

25) The Department Investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility. The member was not sustained.

Allegations were made that this member used profane and unprofessional language with recruit officers during scenario day at the academy.

26) The Department investigated sworn members for violating Department Directives 6.11.2 Responsibility for Preliminary Investigations, 8.10.5 Time-Sensitive Reports and 16.4.3 Body Worn Camera Operation. Both members were sustained on 8.10.5 and received Written Reprimands.
Officers were dispatched to a Domestic Violence call but failed to take photographs of an injury and did not write their supplemental reports in a timely manner.

27) The Department sustained sworn members for violating Department Directive 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility. One member received a 240-hour suspension and one received a 40-hour suspension.

While conducting briefing, a Sergeant read out-loud a text message from an officer which contained anti-gay slurs.

28) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility. The member was not sustained however she did receive a Corrective Action.

While at home member had placed her duty bag, which contained her holstered taser, on the floor in her bedroom. The members daughter and her friend were able to access the taser. The friend shot the members daughter with the taser, resulting in her daughter being shocked and the taser barbs being lodged in her chest and neck.

29) The Department investigated sworn members for violating Department Directives 5.3 Use of Force, 5.4.6 Responsibilities of Supervisory Officer Notified, 6.1.10 Release of Handcuffed Persons Following Investigatory Stop, 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance, 16.4.3 Body Worn Camera Operation, and 17.2.2 Unauthorized Use of CAD and MDC Systems. One member was sustained for 16.4.3 and received a Negative PAE. Another member was sustained on 6.1.10 and 16.4.3 and received a Corrective Action. The supervisor was sustained on 5.4.6 and received a Written Reprimand.

Officers from the Gang Intervention Unit conducted a traffic stop and during the stop they forcibly removed an occupant from the vehicle and arrested him. The subject alleged he was physically assaulted. In addition, it is alleged the officers also placed the second occupant of the vehicle in handcuffs and then released him without charges.

30) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 5.1.3 Other Unauthorized Firing of a Weapon and 7.3.5 Automatic/Semi-Automatic Rifle Training. The member received a 20-hour suspension.

While assisting in looking for a possible armed subject, this member accidentally discharged a round from his rifle causing damage to his patrol vehicle.

31) The Department investigated a non-sworn member for violating Public Safety Communications SOP 108 – General Office Equipment – Console Intercom. The member was not sustained.

Member failed to follow an established Dispatch Standard Operating Procedure regarding the use of the intercom system during a medical emergency that may have delayed the response of Aurora Fire Rescue.

32) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.3 Court. The member received a 10-hour suspension.

Officer missed duty assignments at Municipal Court on six occasions.
33) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.3.8 Police-Community Relations and 17.2.2 Unauthorized Use of CAD and MDC Systems. The member received a 10-hour suspension.

Officer was unprofessional during his contact with a citizen, and also entered inappropriate notes into the CAD after clearing a parking complaint.

34) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.3 Court. The member received a Written Reprimand.

Officer was subpoenaed to, and failed to attend, a DOR hearing resulting in the case being dismissed.

35) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Special Order 18.02 Starchase Vehicle Pursuit Management Technology and Department Directive 14.2.9 Constitutional Requirements. The member was sustained on 14.2.9 and received a Corrective Action.

Member placed a StarChase tracker on a parked, unoccupied vehicle that had previously fled from him.

36) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility. The member received a Corrective Action.

It is alleged that this member made inappropriate gestures towards another member of the police department.

37) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance and 14.3.3 Making a False or Untruthful Declaration. The member was sustained on 14.3.1 and received a Written Reprimand.

This Officer made statements to a Sergeant indicating he had never filled up a patrol car with gas, when in fact he had and that he had never been to District 2 to get blank business cards or actually handed them out, when in fact he had.

38) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.1.5 Conformance to Law, 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility and 14.2.7 Payment of Debts. The member was sustained on 14.2.7 and received a 20-hour suspension.

This member failed to claim income earned while working at an off-duty job.
MEMORANDUM
---

August 16, 2016

TO: Chief of Police: Nick Metz
Deputy Chief of Police: Paul O’Keefe
Division Chiefs: Vanessa Wilson, Kevin Flynn, Jim Puscian
Manager: John Schneebeck
Legal Advisor: Nancy Cornish Rodgers
Lieutenants: Sam McGhee, Chris Juul, Troy Edwards
Sergeant: James Blanton

FROM: Kevin Krogulski, R&D Specialist


This report is an analysis of the police use of force reports completed and submitted for the time period from October 1st, 2014 through September 30th, 2015. This is the second year for the September through October review period as previous analyses used a traditional calendar year (January 1st through December 31st). The reason for this change is so that in the future the analysis will be completed in time for any needed training topics to be included in the following year’s in-service training schedule. The impact of the previous year’s training on use of force incidents will be included in this and all future reports.

Because a number of incidents reported the use of more than one type of force used or more than one officer or subject involved, category totals may equal more than the reported total incidents, or more than 100%. Additionally, some reports were missing data; therefore, not all categories will equal 100% of the incident totals. There were issues of note that delayed the completion of this analysis including a glitch in the Administrative Investigations Management system (AIM) which had to be resolved before the data could be collated and analyzed; the fact that the amount of data had to be separated out which also caused issues with incidents being counted more than
once by the AIM system reporting component and subsequent manual examination and paring of the data having to be completed prior to analysis; some incidents also required a lengthy time frame for command staff review and subsequent recommendations; and finally, the completion of some internal affairs investigations caused delay.

Charts are attached that visually depict portions of the data. While all Use of Force Reports are now recorded electronically in the AIM system, there are some data points that have been added or changed from the old paper reports and the initial electronic reports to make the collected data more accurate and thus more useful. However, this also made comparisons to past years more difficult and in some instances impossible.

For 2015, there were 213 use of force incidents reported involving 143 different officers. Forty-one (41) officers reported being involved in more than one use of force incident during the year.

**Use of Force Overview**

- 2015 experienced a 15.1% decrease in reported use of force incidents when compared to 2014 (213 in 2015 vs. 251 in 2014); following a 67.3% increase in 2014 from 2013 (251 in 2014 vs. 150 in 2013).
- The ratio of use of force incidents per 1000 population decreased significantly for 2015, following the increase observed in 2014. For 2015, the ratio was 0.59 incidents per 1000 population; while in 2014, the ratio was 0.72 incidents.
Use of Force Characteristics

- The call types were not tracked or recorded in the AIM system for 2014 or 2015, though the addition of this field has been requested for future analysis and comparison. The four traditionally highest call nature as recorded on the old paper reports are listed below:

  - Assault
  - Domestic / Family related
  - DUI / Traffic
  - Disorderly / Disturbance

- Each of the top two reasons for use of force were more than double any of the three remaining reasons. Listed below are the reasons given for a use of force (note that more than one reason was often stated for a single incident):

  - Effect the arrest - 84% (178 of 213)
  - Defend officer - 70% (150 of 213)
  - Subject’s safety - 33% (71 of 213)
  - Prevent crime - 31% (67 of 213)
  - Defend another - 27% (58 of 213)
• Type of force used (more than one force type may have been applied during a single incident):

- **Taser** - 55% (118 of 213)
- **Phy.force/ Personal Weapon** - 29% (62 of 213)
- **Baton** - 9% (20 of 213)
- **K-9** - 6% (12 of 213)
- **OC spray** - 4% (9 of 213)
- **Deadly** - 2% (5 of 213)
- **12gau. sock round** - 2% (4 of 213)
- **Carotid** - 1% (3 of 213)
- **Other munitions** - 1% (3 of 213)
- **Pepperball** - 0% (0 of 213)

![Types of Force Used](image)

- After Taser use dropped from 65% of all use of force incidents in 2013 to 48% in 2014, it increased to 55% in 2015 and appears that Taser use continues to be the intermediate weapon of choice over personal weapon, baton, or OC spray.

- The time period of 1600-2359 hours accounted for 33% (71 of 213) of the reported incidents. The time frame of 0000-0759 accounted for 31% (66 of 213), and 0800-1559 accounted for 24% of the reported incidents (52 of 213).

- District One continued to report the highest number of use of force incidents. While the exact cause of this trend is outside the purview of this report, some possibilities are: District
One has the highest population density in Aurora; it historically has the highest crime rates and gang affiliations of any district in the city; it has high immigrant populations which tend to have an inherent distrust for police; and a higher call volume and higher number of sworn personnel in District One which may lead to increased instances where force may be used.

District 1 reported 45% (96 of 213) of all use of force reports in 2015.
District 2 reported 29% (61 of 213).
District 3 reported 20% (43 of 213).
Out of Area / Not Aurora reported 6% (13 of 213).

An Officer was reported injured in 14% (30 of 213) of the 2015 use of force incidents compared to 11% (27 of 251) in 2014. One officer required hospitalization for a gunshot wound in 2015. The remaining officers were either treated and released or no treatment was required.
Use of Force Subject Data

- The involved subject was reported injured in 54% (116 of 213) of the 2015 incidents compared to 59% (147 of 251) in 2014. All reported/observed injuries (including Taser probes) were included, regardless of how minor. Thirteen percent (27 of 213) of the incidents ended with the hospitalization of the subject. It should be noted that not all hospitalizations were necessarily the result of the use of force. It should also be noted that some of the reported hospitalizations were for the same subject on the same call (i.e. gun shot wound reported by several officers). See Diagram above

- During the 2015 reporting period, the subject was reported to have used alcohol in 38% (82 of 213) and drugs in 31% (66 of 213) of the incidents. For 2014, the figures were 47% (118 of 251) and 22% (56 of 251), respectively. The trend from 2014 to 2015 is a slightly lower percentage of subjects using alcohol corresponding with a second straight year of increased drug use amongst those who were the subject of a use of force incident. It is unclear at this time if there is a direct correlation between this and the legalization of marijuana in Colorado.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reported Use of Alcohol/Drugs by Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Incidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Subject information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex: Male</td>
<td>90% (192 of 213)</td>
<td>89% (223 of 251)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3% (6 of 213)</td>
<td>6% (14 of 251)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Race:

- Black - 38% (81 of 213) 41% (102 of 251)
- White - 26% (56 of 213) 34% (85 of 251)
- Hispanic - 16% (34 of 213) 16% (39 of 251)
- Asian - 3% (6 of 213) 1% (1 of 251)
- American Indian 1% (3 of 213) Not Tracked
- Hawaiian / Pac. Islander 1% (1 of 213) 1% (1 of 251)
- Mixed Race 1% (1 of 213) Not Tracked
- Unknown 1% (1 of 213) Not Tracked
- Arab - 0% (0 of 213) 1% (3 of 251)

Policy Review

Directives 5.1 Authorized Firing of a Weapon (revised 03/01/16), Directive 5.3 Use of Physical Force (revised 01/01/16), Directive 5.4 Reporting and Investigating the Use of Tools, Weapons, and Physical Force (revised 07/01/16), and Directive 5.8 Less Lethal Devices, Weapons, and Techniques (revised 01/01/16) were reviewed for this analysis.

Examination of the Command Reviews for the Use of Force reports submitted during this report time frame showed that the majority of the officers were in compliance with use of force policy. Six of the use of force incidents were forwarded to The Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB) as they were officer involved shootings. None of these cases have reached resolution to determine at
this point if they were in policy compliance or not. One incident was found to be in compliance with policy; however, PAEs were recommended due to the use of a baton without obtaining the required medical clearance afterwards. A second call found the use of force itself to be in compliance; however, the call was ultimately sent to IAB for investigation due to the officer not mentioning his intentional knee strike in his report, no pictures of the resulting injury being taken or included in the report, and the sergeant who initially approved the report was on scene and witnessed the use of force yet still approved the report without the mention of the knee strike. It also took the sergeant two months to track the use of force report to his chain of command for the command review. One other issue noted in the statistical report was that different terminology was being used for the same outcomes on the command reviews- the majority stated “PAE neutral, policy compliance, or no further action taken,” though some were left blank and a few others were marked “not applicable.”

At this time, there appear to be no issues with Directives 5.1 or 5.3. The analysis of Directive 5.4 and 5.8 did present a few issues that should be reviewed and/or addressed in the coming year:

- Section 5.4.2, subsection b. states “Tier One notifications and reporting applies to the use of SD1, baton, or other instrument as leverage, or pressure (not strikes or thrusts), and to the use of restraints, a capture pole, or a restraint chair by a member, to overcome resistance. It is not considered a tier one situation when restraining persons solely for medical, emotional, or mental health purposes.” In 2015, there was one reported use of a restraint chair, four reported uses of a hobble along with higher tiered uses of force, and an additional forty-two Tier One uses of force utilizing control techniques and/or hobbles exclusively. It should be noted that the forty-two Tier One uses of force were not included in the 2015 use of force analysis.

- Directive 5.4.2 goes on to state that “Final recommendation(s), determinations, comments, and closure are expected to be completed within seven days of the electronic tracking entry. If the deputy commander / commanding officer believes the actions of the member(s) may have been inappropriate or excessive, they will forward the Use of Force report to the Compliance and Professional Standards Division Chief for determination through the Force Review Board (FRB). If the FRB believes the actions of the member(s) may have been inappropriate or excessive, they will forward the use of force
report to the Internal Affairs Bureau for investigation.” There are two issues associated with this portion of the policy.

- First, is the seven day deadline being met? Who is tracking this to determine if it is being met or not?
- The second possible issue is that there is no recommended time frame for the TRB to review the call or make recommendations to the Internal Affairs Bureau, etc.

- Other than the seven day time frame mentioned above, none of the remaining policy for 5.4 includes any language as to recommended time frames for review or forwarding to the Internal Affairs Bureau.

- Subsection c. also states that “Supervisors will respond to the location of the subject / suspect, check for injuries, ensure medical treatment is provided as needed, photograph any areas when the use of force might have caused injuries (to document no injury exists) and add the photos and their notes, along with any supporting documentation in the Department’s electronic tracking system.” While this may not be a policy issue, it raises the question of who ensures supervisors are responding to these calls and fulfilling these duties.

- Similarly, Directive 5.8.7 states “Once a year during in-service or a quarterly qualification, Training Staff will inspect each member’s canister for date of manufacture. Four years after date of manufacture, members will be instructed to empty the contents of their current canister or turn the canister over to the Quartermaster.” Again, while this is not an issue in the directive itself, is this being tracked to ensure that it is being done each year? Are the canisters entered into the Department’s inventory management system so that new canisters can be ordered as needed when old ones are close to expiration?

- Finally, 5.8.11 states “In the event the subject is transported to any detention facility, the transporting member has the responsibility to notify facility nursing staff that the individual was subjected to less lethal weapons as well as any secondary injuries or conditions that may exist.” Reviewing the hard copy arrest / booking report in conjunction with this directive shows that there is a section to document injuries, prescribed medications, and medical conditions. However, there is no specific place to document that the individual was subjected to less lethal weapons. It was also found that
arrest / booking reports may now also be submitted electronically. I was unable to review an arrest / booking report in electronic format to determine if there were data entry points enabled for less lethal force used, injuries, prescription medications, or medical conditions. It is recommended that the arrest / booking report be reviewed and updated as needed to ensure this information is being relayed to the facility nursing staff.

Training Recommendations

Based upon the command reviews for the UOF incidents reported in 2015, it is difficult to identify areas of deficiency that could be addressed through targeted training. Below are three recommendations that may be beneficial for the Department.

1) One suggestion would be a quick refresher to ensure that all officers know when to offer medical treatment to subjects who have had force used on them and the necessity to always document any and all force used.

2) The second recommendation is ongoing from last year’s analysis- the need for complete, accurate, and consistent completion of the use of force reports. Also, a review of the data sets being collected and determination if any new sets should be added (i.e. call natures where force was used, body worn cameras, etc.) should be conducted to determine feasibility and benefit of inclusion in the analysis.

3) The final recommendation would be to look at the AIM system to determine where changes could be made to ensure answers are more uniform and consistent as well as to look at the year-end report to try and “clean them up” so that both reports detail the same calls, ensuring that the incorrect year cannot be assigned to a current year use of force incident, removing duplicate entries, etc.

Based upon the recommendations from the 2014 Use of Force Analysis, Lt. Juul advised that the use of force reporting has been completely revamped for 2016 and that training in the new
reporting took place in the fourth quarter of 2015 during in-service training. It is anticipated that use of force numbers are going to change due to the new policy. Lt. Juul believes that any subsequent substantial changes in the numbers of force incidents will likely not be a result of more or less force used, but rather the change in the reporting method itself.

**Summary**

This year saw a decline in the number of overall incidents in which an officer used force on a subject. This reduction coincided with an increase in population thus significantly reducing the ratio of incidents per 1000 population.

The top three reasons stated for using force (effect the arrest, defend officer, and subject’s safety) have remained constant since this annual analysis began, though preventing a crime was cited nearly as often as subject safety as a reason for the use of force in 2015. The eight-hour time period of 1600-2359 accounted for 33% (71 of 213) of the use of force incidents – most likely due to the high call volume and confrontation-prone call natures.

Though it has not been tracked for two years now, the top three historical call natures where force was used are Disorderly/Disturbance, Domestic/Family related, and DUI/Traffic related calls. Their order of frequency shifts somewhat yearly but they have remained the top three call natures for use of force for a number of years.

Reported alcohol use by the subject dropped significantly this year while drug use continued its increased trajectory. With the legalization of marijuana in Colorado, this increase in drug use may become a trend.

The percentage of force incidents involving a Taser increased from 48% in 2014 to 55% in 2015, maintaining its status as the type of force most frequently used, and has remained so for the last several years.
As noted earlier in this report, ongoing issues with the AIM system as well as updated data points and new reporting procedures have impacted the entries made on the reports and is an ongoing issue to be aware of and work through for this and future analyses.

In order to find the most benefit from this analysis, the Command Staff may want to look at implementing future changes in the report.

- It may be beneficial to make a command level decision on the types of physical force used—should physical force be broken down further into Koga, Krav Maga, and other types of physical force to better determine what is being used, what is most successful, what is causing more injuries, etc.; or is it sufficient to keep all physical uses of force grouped together for the analysis?

- Another possible data point to look at is how many of the use of force incidents were conducted by officers wearing a body worn camera. This might give some insight into whether or not the cameras have much of an effect on subjects’ response to officers, or officers’ response to subjects.

- Finally, I would suggest breaking down each of the types of force by how many were successful versus how many were not; as well as how many of each type caused injuries. This information might allow the training staff to identify areas where additional training could help to increase the effectiveness of a particular type of force or help to reduce the number of injuries or the seriousness of the injury during a use of force incident.

October 1, 2014 through September 30, 2015 Use of Force incidents with possible issues:

2015-UOF-003 Refer to IA for OIS
2015-UOF-005 (x3) Refer to IA for OIS
2015-UOF-0018 Refer to IA due to initial report not mentioning knee strike, no pics, etc.
2015-UOF-0029 Refer to IA for OIS
2015-UOF-0064 In compliance, but PAE for no medical clearance obtained after baton use
2015-UOF-0071 Refer IA for OIS
This document contains an analysis of the Aurora Police Departments’ Use of Force for activity occurring October 1, 2015 – September 30, 2016

Data Source: Administrative Investigations Management

Prepared by: Ivanna Navarrete
Reviewed & Edited by: Professional Standards Division Contributors
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Introduction

Aurora Police Department’s mission statement is to make Aurora safer every day. Making Aurora safer requires ongoing evaluations of the Department’s policy and procedure to best serve the needs of the community and reduce crime. Consequently, The Department conducted a significant restructure of its use of force directive effective January, 2016. Use of force incidents are categorized into three tiers as follows:

Figure 1. New Tier System

Further, the Aurora Police Department has created the Force Review Board; a body of sworn officers which convenes to review Tier 2 and Tier 3 cases. These cases are reviewed for compliance with applicable state statues and department directives.

This report will account for the current reporting period which may be analyzed in comparison to reporting periods prior to 2016. Due to the differing types of force categories captured for analysis completed prior to 2016 as well as the change in procedure, there will be some differences with how the information is analyzed; nonetheless, all efforts were made to best incorporate and compare the Department’s use of force. Refer to Appendix A for Use of Force Matrix

Executive Summary

The Department’s Administrative Investigations Management (AIM) software current report settings for the reporting timeframe of 10/01/2015-09/30/2016 yielded the following data:

- Total of 277 incident reports
- Officers = 232 | Average age =40 | Average years with the Department = 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Breakdown:</th>
<th>Race Breakdown:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Male – 206 (89%)</td>
<td>• American Indian or Alaskan – 1 (0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Female – 26 (11%)</td>
<td>• Asian – 3 (1.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• African American /Black - 9 (3.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hispanic or Latino – 24 (10.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Two or More Races – 6 (2.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• White – 189 (81.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Subjects = 290 | Average age = 28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Breakdown:</th>
<th>Race Breakdown:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Male – 244 (84%)</td>
<td>• African American/Black – 156 (53.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Female – 46 (16%)</td>
<td>• Asian – 2 (0.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Caucasian/White – 89 (30.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hispanic – 43 (14.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Incidents by Districts:
- District 1 – 151 (54.5%)
- District 2 – 79 (28.5%)
- District 3 – 41 (14.8%)
- Outside City Jurisdiction – 4 (1.4%)
- Not provided – 2 (0.7%)

The majority of incidents (50) occurred the month of January 2016

The highest number of incidents occurred on Fridays and the lowest number occurred on Wednesdays.

Use of force effectiveness:

All Occurrences
- Successful – 438 (74%)
- Somewhat Successful – 91 (15%)
- Unsuccessful – 61 (10%)

Total = 590

Figures & Graphs

The figures and tables presented in this report are all conclusions based on the use of force reports produced from AIM. Due to software configurations, the report creation functionality limits the number of fields in any given report. The Use of Force reports have been broken up into two reports. Table 1 provides the two naming conventions automatically assigned to each report and the fields that were included in each extraction. The extraction associated to the information presented in this report experienced some problems. In some instances, the information was mismatched or the information could not be obtained from AIM for the report. These issues were brought up to our AIM Administrator who is working with the vendor to identify the problem and address it accordingly.

Table 1. Use of Force Report Configuration Fields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incident number</td>
<td>Incident number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Name</td>
<td>Employee Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Name</td>
<td>Subject Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Officer Injured – Employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident Date</td>
<td>Officer Injury Type – Employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Officer Role – Employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day of Week</td>
<td>Officer Treatment – Employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Subject Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beat</td>
<td>Subject Race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Offense</td>
<td>✗ = field did not extract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for Force</td>
<td>✷ = fields primarily blank with a few “N/A”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Reason for Force</td>
<td>Type of force/Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Force/Effectiveness</td>
<td>Other Weapon Desc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Weapon Desc</td>
<td>Deadly Force Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Weapons Type</td>
<td>Other Launch-able Munitions* Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Launch-able Munitions* Type</td>
<td>Other Launch-able Munitions* # Hits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj Injured</td>
<td>Subj Injured Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj Injured Nature</td>
<td>Subj Serious Bodily Injury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj Serious Bodily Injury</td>
<td>Subj Obvious Less Lethal Injuries Desc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj Obvious Less Lethal Injuries Desc</td>
<td>Subj Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj Treatment</td>
<td>Subj Rendered Unconscious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj Rendered Unconscious</td>
<td>Sub Alcohol Impairment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Alcohol Impairment</td>
<td>Subj Drug Impairment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj Drug Impairment</td>
<td>Subj Drug Overdose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj Drug Overdose</td>
<td>Subject Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Age</td>
<td>Subject Sex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tier Breakdown:
- Pre-2016 – 49 (17.7%)
- Tier 1 – 152 (54.9%)
- Tier 2 – 70 (25.3%)
- Tier 3 – 6 (2.2%)

1 Some incidents contain multiple uses of force
* Launch-able Munitions is actually labeled “Lncible Mntns”
Demographics of Incidents

This section is an analysis of the Aurora Police Department’s use of force reports that were completed and submitted for the time period of October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016.

*Figure 2a* presents a three-year comparison of the Departments’ use of force incidents with 2016 totals reflecting the new Tier system effective January 1st 2016. *Figure 2b* presents a three-year comparison based on previous use of force policy (removing the 152 incidents that were categorized as Tier 1). Prior to utilizing the Tier System, Tier 1 incidents would not be documented. Therefore it’s important to note that although there seems to be a 30% increase in incidents from 2015 to 2016, if the Department measured use of force in the same fashion, there would have been a 41% decrease.

*Table 2* provides the ratio of Aurora’s use of force incident to population, percentage of population change from year-to-year and the percentage change of incidents year-to-year. For 2016, the Department had a 30.5% increase in use of force incidents compared to last year.

Table 2. Use of Force Incident & Population Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Incidents</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Ratio (per 1000)</th>
<th>% Change in Population</th>
<th>% Change in Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>347,953.00</td>
<td>0.72136179</td>
<td>+ 2.3%</td>
<td>+ 67.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>351,200.00</td>
<td>0.60649203</td>
<td>+ 0.9%</td>
<td>- 15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>357,346.00</td>
<td>0.77515909</td>
<td>+ 1.8%</td>
<td>+ 30.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2 K. Krogulski’s 2014 & 2015 original population counts have been updated with information provided via J. Schneebeck’s monthly staffing report data.
Table 3 and Table 4 provides a demographic analysis of the Department’s use of force incidents. Gender breakdown is represented via Figure 3, and shows us that out of the 290 subjects, 46 were Female (15.8%) and 244 were Male (84.2%). Figure 4 provides a bar graph that shows us the gender breakdown of our subjects as it relates to our Districts.

Figure 3. Use of Force Gender Breakdown

Figure 4. Use of Force Gender Breakdown by District

Table 3. Gender Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Sex</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

District 1 experienced the highest use of force: 151 incidents (54.5%) and 161 subjects (55.5%), despite the fact District 2 - Beat 16 had the overall highest number of incident occurrences totaling 20. To see how each incident count is tied to a Beat, go to Appendix B.

Figure 5 below provides a graphical summary of incidents by Beat, with the exception of six privatized incidents.

Table 4. Gender Breakdown by District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Subject Total</th>
<th>Incident Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside City Jurisdiction (OCJ)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Provided (NP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>238</strong></td>
<td><strong>290</strong></td>
<td><strong>277</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. Use of Force by District & Beat
**Figure 6** pie chart provides a percentage breakdown by District to include outside city jurisdiction and blank entries. Knowing the ethnic component of subjects in use of force incidents is critical in identifying if the Department’s UOF would differ based on a deeper understanding of how to best communicate with subjects:

“Police departments have to work hard to become familiar with the various ethnic and racial groups that they serve, to understand their languages, customs and traditions, and to establish mechanisms for communicating with them. A component of such communication ought to be in the department’s articulation of its values in interacting with the community.”

![Figure 6. Use of Force Pie Chart of Incident Percentage per District](image)

**Figures 7** outlines the UOF subjects’ race presented in the form of percentage breakdowns and **Table 5** provides numeric count by race.

![Figure 7. Use of Force Race Percentage Breakdown](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>290</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observation 1: Race & Gender Discrepancy**

The subject’s gender and race was not consistently identified in AIM. A subject’s missing age and gender was taken from information entered in the records management system (Versadex). Due to this observation, efforts were made and in the majority of incidents, the race was updated in AIM accordingly.

---

3https://www.justice.gov/archive/crs/pubs/pdexcess.htm
Figure 8 shows the Department’s use of force racial breakdown and how that compares with the city’s statistics reported via “Who is Aurora 2016 Demographic Report”. It is interesting to note that with the exception of African American/Black, the remaining racial groups were within sixteen percentage points of the city’s population.

Figure 8. Racial Percentage Comparison: Use of Force Racial Population vs. City Population

![Bar chart showing racial percentage comparison](image)

Observation 2: Age Discrepancy

The “Subject Age” from Report 1 did not always match “Subject Age” from report 2. Some of the discrepancies were due to subjects’ age not being entered and/or populated in either report or subjects’ age that was entered did not match. It appears that one report was showing age based on the UOF occurrence –incident date; and the other report was showing subject’s age based on their date of birth –DOB. In an effort to report the most accurate information, a random selection of subjects’ age was selected and their age was verified against Versadex. Per the results, a conclusion can be drawn that using the “Subject Age” from Report 1 is most accurate. In an effort to address this discrepancy, a meeting was held with the department’s AIM Administrator to address this issues. The AIM Administrator confirmed that subjects’ age should only be included in one report and the field selected should be “Subject Age at Incident”.

The average age for all UOF Incidents for the reporting period of 10/01/2015 – 09/30/2016 is 28 years old with the exclusion of six privatized incidents. Female subjects’ average age is 27 and male subjects’ average age is 29. Figure 9 is a line graph that shows the total count of subjects based on their age at the time of the incident.

Figure 9. Use of Force Age Breakdown by Gender Count

![Line graph showing age breakdown](image)
Use of Force Characteristics

Evaluation of Action Taken

Figure 10a and 10b has data associated with the “Action Taken” by a supervisor, review board, chief, etc., based on the employee’s conduct, but where no allegation was made. Ninety-six-point-eight percent (96.8%) of incidents were reported as being Policy Compliance⁴, two-point-two percent (2.2%) were referred to Internal Affairs, zero-point-seven percent (0.7%) were classified as PAE – Neutral and zero-point-four percent (0.4%) to training⁵.

The following are some notes corresponding to original categories:

- Although there were 50 incidents that did not specify “Action Taken” under the assigned field. All incidents that had a blank field were reviewed and an ‘action taken’ was properly assigned. In 48 incidents, the action was “Policy Compliance” and the other two incidents (2016-UOF-0202 & 0250) were “Policy Compliance” and “Referred to Training”. To ensure an incident was not counted twice, all 50 incidents have been counted as “Policy Compliance”.

- There were 36 entries that had selected “No Further Action Taken” and these entries were also reviewed by an officer from the Professional Standard Division and confirmed that the classification should be “Policy Compliance”.

Figure 10a. Disposition of Use of Force – Incident Count

Figure 10b. Percentage of Disposition Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Incident Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy Compliance</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to Internal Affairs</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAE - Neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observation 3: Officer Involved Shooting (OIS) UOF Reports Missing from Extraction

There were a couple of observations:

1) 2015 UOF incidents: 0154, 0159, 0161 and 0158 were not extracted and therefore not included in the results when a report was produced. The cause of this issue remains unknown, and will be followed up with the AIM administrator to determine a cause.

2) AIM recognized three reports but due to privatization, there was insufficient data for analysis. However, some information is available if the individual incident is pulled up in AIM. All privatized incidents were reviewed in an effort to include any available information throughout this report.

---

⁴ There were 36 entries that especially entered: “No Further Action Taken”

⁵ Two (2016-UOF-0202 & 0250) of the 268 incidents were also referred to Training and to void double counting, they were not included in the Training figures.
Table 6 and Figure 11 show that the disposition of use of force and the correlation between the “Action Taken” and its assigned Tier. The majority of use of force incidents were classified as Tier 1 – 150 incidents (54%) and the remaining incidents classified as follows: Tier 2 – 72 incidents (25.9%), Pre-2016 – 49 incidents (17.6%) and Tier 3 – 6 incidents (2.1%).

Table 6. Use of Force by Tier to Policy (Action Taken)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Pre-2016</th>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>Tier 2</th>
<th>Tier 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy Compliance</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to IA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAE - Neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Force Effectiveness Analysis

Some incidents had only one use of force entry and others had up to thirteen entries associated to one incident. Altogether, there was a total of 590 Use of Force entries: 438 were ranked successful, 91 were ranked somewhat successful, and 61 were ranked unsuccessful. Figure 12 shows the percentage breakdown of its effectiveness and Table 7 provides a summary count of each entry.

Figure 12. Use of Force Effectiveness by Occurrence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Successful</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 13 is a three-year comparison of use of force categories based on previous reporting submission. Please note that the count for 2014 and 2015 is directly taken from the bar graph on page four of the report submitted for the 10/01/2014 – 09/30/2015. It is only a comparison of nine types of use of force and does not reflect all the categories.
Type of Offense

*Figure 14* provides a percentage breakdown by offense classification and *Table 8* shows the count distribution.

![Figure 14. Type of Offense Percentage Distribution](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Offense</th>
<th>Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Felony</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misdemeanor</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective Custody</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>277</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reason for Force

*Figure 15* shows us a count of all entries associated to why force was used. Note that the total count does not equal the total number of incidents nor the total number of subjects. Multiple reasons were listed per incident to support why a use of force was delivered to the subject(s) corresponding to each incident.

![Figure 15. Count by Reason for Force](image)

**Table 8. Type of Offense Count**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Force</th>
<th>Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Hold (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintentional discharge of weapon (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resisitive Party (C)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary to Defend Another (D)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary to Prevent a Crime (E)</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Subjects Safety (F)</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary to Defend Officer (G)</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary to Effect Arrest (H)</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total**

**277**

*Figure 16. Reason for Force Percentage Distribution*
Recommendations

1. A meeting with the decision makers should be held to re-evaluate the current reporting structure and determine what information should be captured that is missing in this report and/or confirm the fields that the Department wants to capture.

2. When reporting use of force, all efforts should be made to have all AIM field completed. Blank entries may provide incorrect analysis and have negative consequences that reflect poorly on the Department’s actual use of force tactics.

3. If the tool is available in AIM, consideration should be made to make certain fields a requirement.

4. It may be beneficial for training personnel/academy staff to evaluate the less successful techniques and whether the tactics were matched to the severity of the incident or if escalation of techniques were appropriately performed.

5. It is good practice to be aware of any recent studies and reports related to use of force. This allows the Department the opportunity to consistently evaluate its policies and procedure with other police departments and see how Aurora’s results compare with those around the nation. In March 2016, the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) published Guiding Principles on Use of Force and it discusses 1) “Why We Need to Challenge Conventional Thinking on Police Use of Force”, 2) “PERF’s 30 Guiding Principles on Use of Force”, 3) “PERF’s Critical Decision-Making Model” and 4) “Lessons Learned from Police Scotland”. Below is the Critical Decision-Making Model referenced in the study that provides a nice visual for critical thinking and determining use of force steps.

---

6 [http://www.policeforum.org/assets/30%20guiding%20principles.pdf](http://www.policeforum.org/assets/30%20guiding%20principles.pdf)
# Appendix A – Use of Force Tiers

## Tier Zero
- This is NOT considered to be a use of force per APD policy.
  - Firearm Gun Point - @TZG
  - Less Lethal Shotgun or Projectile Launcher Weapon Point - @TSL
  - Handcuff & Release - No Charges - @TZH

**Reporting Requirements:** One CAD Entry per call no matter how many officers point weapons. No additional supervisor action required. CAD notes added to depict why weapons were pointed or a cuff and release was conducted.

## Tier One
- Use of Force with No or Minor Injury/Use of Restraint. Make sure to offer medical assistance.
  - Control Techniques used to overcome physical resistance with No injury/Minor Injury
  - Take Down No Injury/Minor Injury
  - Use of control weapon (Baton or SD-1) for leverage or control purposes (no strikes or thrusts)
  - Use of restraints, capture pole or restraint chair to overcome resistance

**Reporting Requirements:** Determination to be made by supervisor, based on treatment status at time of release, if such use of force did not result in injury requiring professional medical treatment. A GO is required, notification of supervisor and Use of Force in Electronic Tracking System is Required. Supervisor to document injuries (no injury) & investigation to be completed by supervisor and tracked through the chain of command. Photographs of injuries or lack thereof must be taken.

## Tier Two
- Use of weapon other than a deadly weapon to overcome resistance or when subject is injured by member’s application of force and requires professional medical treatment. Make sure to offer medical assistance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier Two</th>
<th>Tier One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pepper Spray</td>
<td>Taser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton</td>
<td>Police Canine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launcherable Impact Weapons</td>
<td>Pitting of Vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carotid Control Hold</td>
<td>Punches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strikes</td>
<td>Kicks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knees</td>
<td>Any injury in Tier One requiring Professional Medical Treatment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reporting Requirements:** Notify Supervisor, Use of Force Report in Electronic Tracking System completed by supervisor with documentation & investigation. Track Use of Force report through chain of command for review and ultimately to the Compliance and Professional Standards Division, Division Chief. Photographs of injuries or lack thereof must be taken.

## Tier Three
- Use of a deadly weapon, or deadly force, or potentially deadly force regardless of any injury. It also applies to the use of force, tools, or weapons, which result in hospitalization or death; or when a supervisor in conjunction with the Duty Captain, believes a use of force, weapons, or tools warrants a Tier Three notification and response. Make sure to offer medical assistance to all injured party/s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of Force/ Critical Incident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Deadly Weapon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Deadly Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Potentially Deadly Force (regardless of injury)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of force, tools or weapons which result in hospitalization or death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When a supervisor in conjunction with Duty Captain believes UOF, weapons or tools warrants a Tier Three notification and response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Training Accident involving a firearm when another person is struck by a bullet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Training Accident involving a firearm when person dies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reporting Requirements:** Notification initiated to member’s immediate supervisor, Duty Captain immediately notify Investigations Bureau Commander. Reported in AIM as well. Any training accident when another person is struck by a bullet requires notification to the Duty Captain. Supervisor will NOT conduct an investigation into a Tier Three critical incident, however the supervisor will gather and enter sufficient information to start a Use of Force Report in AIM to be tracked immediately to the Compliance and Professional Standards Bureau Division Chief only. Photographs of injuries or lack thereof must be taken.
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The Aurora Police Department’s mission is to make Aurora safer every day. Making Aurora safer requires ongoing evaluation of the department’s policies and procedures to ensure that they best serve the needs of the community and reduce crime. Consequently, the department conducted a significant restructure of its use of force directive, effective January 2016. Use of force (UoF) incidents are categorized into three tiers as follows:

**TIER 1**
An application of force that simply involves physical control holds or tactics designed to gain compliance or overcome resistance. The force does not result in injury requiring professional medical treatment and does not involve the use of defensive weapons. Tier 1 UoF are reviewed up to the district deputy commander level. Some may be sent to the Force Review Board.

**TIER 2**
An application of force involving the use of intermediary defensive weapons such as tasers, batons, personal weapons, and/or results in injury requiring professional medical treatment. Tier 2 UoF are reviewed by the Force Review Board.

**TIER 3**
An application of a deadly weapon, or deadly force, or potentially deadly force regardless of any injury. It also applies to the use of force, tools, or weapons, which result in hospitalization. Tier 3 UoF are reviewed by the Force Review Board.

The Force Review Board (FRB) consists of a body of sworn officers that reviews all of the Tier 2 and Tier 3 incidents. The FRB will also review any Tier 1 incidents that are deemed by the respective chain of command to be in need of additional review. The FRB reviews these cases for compliance with applicable state statues and department directives, as well as any training deficiencies.

Directive 05.04 Reporting and Investigating the Use of Tools, Weapons and Physical Force is the primary policy controlling the use of force within the police department. The entire process of reporting, investigating and determining what constitutes a use of force was significantly changed in January 2016. Directive 05.04 was recently revised on December 7, 2017.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The department tracks use of force statistics through Administrative Investigations Management (AIM) software. There were 601 Use of Force incident reports from January 1- December 31, 2017.

- Officers involved: 1191 | Average age = 37 | Average years with the department = 8.7
- Subjects involved: 626 | Average age = 29

**Officer Demographics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two or more Races</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Officers are counted each time they are involved in a discrete incident, and each incident can involve multiple officers. A total of 356 officers were involved in Use of Force incidents in 2017.

**Subject Demographics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/Indian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two or more Races</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Subjects are counted each time they are involved in a discrete incident, and each incident can involve multiple subjects.

**Incident Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident by District</th>
<th>Tier Breakdown by Incident</th>
<th>Effectiveness*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>Successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 2</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>Somewhat Successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside City Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Effectiveness statistics reflect the highest use of force by each officer for each subject involved in an incident.

- The highest number of the incidents (70) occurred in the month of August 2017.
- The highest number of incidents (209 – 34.5%) occurred between 18:01 – 24:00.
- The highest number of incidents occurred on Saturday (103 – 17%) and the lowest occurred on Tuesday (73 – 12%).
FIGURES & GRAPHS

The figures and tables presented in this report are all conclusions based on the UoF fields exported from AIM.

DEMOGRAPHICS OF INCIDENTS

This section is an analysis of the Aurora Police Department’s UoF reports that were completed and submitted for the time period of January 1, 2017 through December 31, 2017. Table 1 presents a three-year comparison of the department’s UoF incidents. The tier system was implemented in 2016; therefore, 2015 incident counts are based on the prior system.

It is important to note this year the reporting timeframe has been adjusted to report incidents occurring between January 1 and December 31, verses October 1 through September 30. Therefore, there is an incident count change from last year’s report of 2016 incidents that occurred between September 1, 2015 and August 30, 2016. For the purpose of an accurate comparison and the ability to analyze the change from the previous year, this 2016 incident count is based on incidents that occurred January 1, 2016 through December 31, 2016.

Table 1 provides the ratio of Aurora’s UoF incidents to population, percentage of population change from year-to-year and the percentage change of incidents year-to-year. For 2017, the department had a 12.6% decrease in UoF incidents as compared to 2016.

**TABLE 1. USE OF FORCE INCIDENT & POPULATION COMPARISON**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Incidents</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Ratio (per 1000)</th>
<th>% Change in Population</th>
<th>% Change in Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>351,200</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>+ 0.93% 📈</td>
<td>- 15.1% 📈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>357,346</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>+ 1.75% 📈</td>
<td>+ 223.0% 📈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>361,103</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>+ 1.05% 📈</td>
<td>- 12.6% 📈</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 provides the overall subject gender breakdown.

**TABLE 2. SUBJECT GENDER BREAKDOWN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Sex</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3. SUBJECT GENDER BREAKDOWN BY DISTRICT

This chart shows a breakdown of incidents in each district by subject gender. Use of Force incidents had an overall 12.6% decrease from 2016 to 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Subject Total</th>
<th>Incident Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>304 – 48.6%</td>
<td>299 – 49.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>221 – 35.3%</td>
<td>201 – 33.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>89 – 14.2%</td>
<td>92 – 15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside City Jurisdiction (OCJ)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12 – 1.9%</td>
<td>9 – 1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>143</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>601</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure A* below provides a graphical summary of incidents by patrol beat, with the exception of nine incidents that occurred outside the city jurisdiction (OCJ). The average count of incidents per patrol beat was 22.

**FIGURE A. USE OF FORCE BY DISTRICT & BEAT**
Figure B shows the UoF subjects’ race and Table 4 provides numeric count by race. CALEA Statistical Tables race categories differ from what the Aurora Police Department tracks due to the fact that it does not differentiate White non-Hispanic, Black non-Hispanic or Hispanic-Latino. AIM reporting does not differentiate on the type of Hispanic, whether they are of white or black ancestry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Indian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>626</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
USE OF FORCE CHARACTERISTICS

EVALUATION OF ACTION TAKEN

*Figure D, Figure E* and *Table 5* has data associated with the action taken by a supervisor, review board or chief following the use of force by each officer. Most (98.2%) incidents were reported as being Policy Compliant. The number of dispositions is slightly higher than the number of uses of force by officers due to the fact that some policy compliant cases were also recommended for additional training or counseling.

FIGURE D: DISPOSITION BREAKDOWN BY EMPLOYEE

![Bar Chart](chart.png)

**TABLE 5. USE OF FORCE DISPOSITIONS BY INCIDENT & TIER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Taken</th>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>Tier 2</th>
<th>Tier 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commander Commendation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Further Action Taken</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Compliance</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to Internal Affairs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total:</strong></td>
<td>459</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>601</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FORCE ANALYSIS

Tracking the type of force used is critical to evaluating if current practices among officers is having the intended outcome when dealing with subjects. Table 6 provides a detail of types of force used for Tier 1 & Tier 2/3. In 2017, five of the Tier 2/3 uses of force (spanning four incidents) were Tier 3. They are comprised of four uses of deadly force and one “other” use of force. Table 6 reflects the highest use of force by each officer for each subject involved in an incident.

Table 6. Tier 1 & Tier 2/3 Type of Force Occurrences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tier 2 &amp; 3</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 gauge sock round</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carotid Control Hold</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control techniques (Tier 2)</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadly force (firearm)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobble</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other launchable munitions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.C. (pepper spray)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal weapons</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIT maneuvers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police K-9 (Deployments '16=1292 / '17=1320)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taser</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total tier 2/3</strong></td>
<td><strong>489</strong></td>
<td><strong>257</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baton used for leverage or push</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control techniques</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>378</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobble</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other restraints</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD1 (mini baton)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total tier 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>414</strong></td>
<td><strong>478</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note that the totals for tier 1 & 2 exceed the total incident counts due to the possibility of multiple uses of force per incident.
**TYPE OF OFFENSE**

*Figure F* and *Table 7* the kind of offense that each subject was contacted by police for in each use of force incident. They are presented by subject because more than one person could be contacted for different reasons within the same incident.

**FIGURE F. TYPE OF OFFENSE PERCENTAGE BY SUBJECT**

**TABLE 7. TYPE OF OFFENSE COUNT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Offense</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Felony</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misdemeanor</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Offense</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective Custody</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total:</td>
<td>626</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REASON FOR FORCE**

*Figure G* shows a count of all entries associated to why force was used. Note that the total count does not equal the total number of incidents nor the total number of subjects. This is due to multiple reasons being listed per incident to support why a UoF was necessary, corresponding to each incident.

**FIGURE G. REASON FOR FORCE**
INJURIES

Figure H shows how many subjects and how many officers were injured in 2017 by incident. Both officers and subjects could be involved in multiple incidents with different outcomes.

FIGURE H. INJURIES BY PERSON AND INCIDENT

![Bar chart showing injuries by person and incident]
### APPENDIX I – USE OF FORCE 2017 CALEA TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017 Use of Force</th>
<th>White Non-Hispanic</th>
<th>Black Non-Hispanic</th>
<th>Hispanic Latino Any Race</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearm Discharge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearm Display Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DISPLAY NOT TRACKED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Control Weapon (Taser) Discharge</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Control Weapon (Taser) Display Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DISPLAY NOT TRACKED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical/OC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaponless</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canine Release Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GENDER AND RACE NOT TRACKED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canine Release and Bite</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Uses of Force</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of Suspects Receiving Non-Fatal Injuries</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of Suspects Receiving Fatal Injuries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of Incidents Resulting In Officer Injury or Death</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Use of Force Arrests</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Agency Custodial Arrests</td>
<td>2,129</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>2,896</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>1,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Use of Force Complaints</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX II - USE OF FORCE TIERS

**TIER ZERO** - This is NOT considered to be a use of force per APD policy

* Firearm Gun Point - @TZG
* Less Lethal Shotgun or Projectile Launcher Weapon Point - @TZL
* Handcuff & Release - No Charges - @TZH

**Reporting Requirements:** One CAD Entry per call no matter how many officers point weapons. No additional supervisor action required. CAD notes added to depict why weapons were pointed or a cuff and release was conducted.

**TIER ONE** - Use of Force with No or Minor Injury/Use of Restraint.

* Take Down No Injury/Minor Injury
* Use of restraints, capture pole or restraint chair to overcome resistance
* Control Techniques used to overcome physical resistance with No injury/Minor Injury
* Use of control weapons (Baton or SD-1) for leverage or control purposes (no strikes or thrusts)

**Reporting Requirements:** Determination to be made by supervisor, based on treatment status at time of release, if such UoF did not result in injury which required professional medical treatment. A GO is required, notification of supervisor and UoF in Electronic Tracking System is Required. Supervisor to document injuries or lack thereof and investigation to be completed by supervisor and tracked through the chain of command. Photographs of injuries or lack thereof must be taken.

**TIER TWO** - Use of weapon other than a deadly weapon to overcome resistance or when subject is injured by member's application of force and requires professional medical treatment.

* Pepper Spray  * Taser  * Lauchable Impact Weapons  * Kicks  * Carotid Control Hold
* Baton  * Police Canine  * Pitting of Vehicle  * Knees  * Strikes
* Punches  * Any injury in Tier One requiring Professional Medical Treatment

**Reporting Requirements:** Notify Supervisor, UoF Report in Electronic Tracking System completed by Supervisor with documentation & investigation. Track UoF report through chain of command for review and ultimately to the Compliance and Professional Standards Division, Division Chief. Photographs of injuries or lack thereof must be taken.

**TIER THREE** - Use of a deadly weapon, or deadly force, or potentially deadly force, regardless of any injury. It also applies to the UoF, tools or weapons, which result in hospitalization or death; or when a supervisor in conjunction with the Duty Captain, believes a use of force, weapons, or tools warrants a Tier Three notification and response.

* Use of Force/Critical Incident  * Use of Deadly Weapon  * Use of Deadly Force  * Use of Potentially Deadly Force
* Use of force, tools or weapons which results in hospitalization or death
* When a supervisor in conjunction with Duty Captain believes UoF, weapons or tools warrants a Tier 3 notification & response
* Any Training Accident involving a firearm when another person is struck by a bullet and/or dies

**Reporting Requirements:** Notification initiated to member's immediate supervisor, Duty Captain immediately notify Investigations Bureau Commander. Reported in Electronic Tracking System as well. Any training accident when another person is struck by a bullet requires notification of the Duty Captain. Supervisor will NOT conduct an investigation into a Tier 3 critical incident, however, the supervisor will gather & enter sufficient information to start a UoF report in Electronic Tracking System to be tracked immediately to the Compliance & PSS Bureau Division Chief only. Photographs of injuries or lack thereof must be taken.
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INTRODUCTION

The Aurora Police Department’s mission is to make Aurora safer every day. Making Aurora safer requires ongoing evaluation of the department’s policies and procedures to ensure that they best serve the needs of the community and reduce crime. Consequently, the department conducted a significant restructure of its use of force directive, effective January 2016. Use of force (UoF) incidents are categorized into three tiers as follows:

**TIER 1**
An application of force that simply involves physical control holds or tactics designed to gain compliance or overcome resistance. The force does not result in injury requiring professional medical treatment and does not involve the use of defensive weapons. Tier 1 UoF are reviewed up to the district deputy commander level. Some may be sent to the Force Review Board.

**TIER 2**
An application of force involving the use of intermediary defensive weapons such as tasers, batons, personal weapons, and/or results in injury requiring professional medical treatment. Tier 2 UoF are reviewed by the Force Review Board.

**TIER 3**
An application of a deadly weapon, or deadly force, or potentially deadly force regardless of any injury. It also applies to the use of force, tools, or weapons, which result in hospitalization. Tier 3 UoF are reviewed by the Force Review Board.

The Force Review Board (FRB) consists of a body of sworn officers that reviews all of the Tier 2 and Tier 3 incidents. The FRB will also review any Tier 1 incidents that are deemed by the respective chain of command to be in need of additional review. The FRB reviews these cases for compliance with applicable state statues and department directives, as well as any training deficiencies.

Directive 05.04 Reporting and Investigating the Use of Tools, Weapons and Physical Force is the primary policy controlling the use of force within the police department. Directive 05.04 had no revisions in 2018.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The department tracks use of force statistics through Administrative Investigations Management (AIM) software. There were 592 Use of Force incident reports from January 1, 2018- December 31, 2018.

- Officers involved: 1212 | Average age = 36 | Average years with the department = 7
- Subjects involved: 612 | Average age = 31

### Officer Demographics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>1100</th>
<th>90.8%</th>
<th>American Indian</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>.3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two or more Races</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Officers are counted each time they are involved in a separate incident, and each incident can involve multiple officers. A total of 367 officers were involved in Use of Force incidents in 2018.

### Subject Demographics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>490</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>American Indian</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>.2%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Arab</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two or more Races</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Subjects are counted each time they are involved in a separate incident, and each incident can involve multiple subjects.

### Incident Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident by District</th>
<th>Tier Breakdown by Incident</th>
<th>Effectiveness*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>Tier 1 404</td>
<td>664 80.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 2</td>
<td>Tier 2 179</td>
<td>88 10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>Tier 3 9</td>
<td>77 9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside City Jurisdiction</td>
<td>10 1.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Effectiveness statistics reflect each separate use of force for each subject involved in an incident.

- The highest number of the incidents (57) occurred in both March and June.
- The highest number of incidents (302) occurred on the swing shift from 1500-0100.
- The highest number of incidents occurred on Fridays and Saturdays (92 each); however, incidents were pretty evenly spread throughout the week.
FIGURES & GRAPHS

The figures and tables presented in this report are all conclusions based on the UoF fields exported from AIM.

DEMOGRAPHICS OF INCIDENTS

This section is an analysis of the Aurora Police Department’s UoF reports that were completed and submitted for the time period of January 1, 2018 through December 31, 2018. Table 1 presents a three-year comparison of the department's UoF incidents.

It is important to note this year the reporting timeframe has been adjusted to report incidents occurring between January 1 and December 31, verses October 1 through September 30. Therefore, there is an incident count change from the 2016 report incidents that occurred between September 1, 2015 and August 30, 2016. For the purpose of an accurate comparison and the ability to analyze the change from the previous year, this 2016 incident count is based on incidents that occurred January 1, 2016 through December 31, 2016.

Table 1 provides the ratio of Aurora’s UoF incidents to population, percentage of population change from year-to-year and the percentage change of incidents year-to-year. For 2018, the department had a 1.5% decrease in UoF incidents as compared to 2017.

TABLE 1. USE OF FORCE INCIDENT & POPULATION COMPARISON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Incidents</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Ratio (per 1000)</th>
<th>% Change in Population</th>
<th>% Change in Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>357,346</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>+ 1.75%</td>
<td>+ 223.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>361,103</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>+ 1.05%</td>
<td>- 12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>374,154</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>+ 3.61%</td>
<td>- 1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The large increase in the 2016 incidents over 2015 stems from the policy change in which Tier 1 uses of force are counted.

TABLE 2. SUBJECT GENDER BREAKDOWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Sex</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE A. THREE-YEAR TREND: SUBJECT GENDER BREAKDOWN

TABLE 3. SUBJECT GENDER BREAKDOWN BY DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Subject Total</th>
<th>Incident Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>306 – 50%</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>199 – 32.5%</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>94 – 15.4%</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside City Jurisdiction (OCJ)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13 – 2.1%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure B below provides a graphical summary of incidents by patrol beat, with the exception of ten incidents that occurred outside the city jurisdiction (OCJ). The average count of incidents per patrol beat was 22.

**FIGURE B. USE OF FORCE BY DISTRICT & BEAT**

![Graph showing use of force by district and beat](image)

Figure C shows the UoF subjects’ race and Table 4 provides numeric count by race. CALEA Statistical Tables race categories differ from what the Aurora Police Department tracks due to the fact that it does not differentiate White non-Hispanic, Black non-Hispanic or Hispanic-Latino. AIM reporting does not differentiate on the type of Hispanic, whether they are of white or black ancestry.

**FIGURE C. USE OF FORCE PERCENTAGE BY SUBJECT RACE**

![Pie chart showing use of force percentage by subject race](image)

**TABLE 4. SUBJECT RACE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>612</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE D: THREE YEAR TREND: USE OF FORCE PERCENTAGE BY SUBJECT RACE

FIGURE E. USE OF FORCE AGE COUNT BY SUBJECT GENDER AT AGE OF THE TIME OF THE INCIDENT

FIGURE F. THREE YEAR TREND: SUBJECT’S AVERAGE AGE AT THE TIME OF THE INCIDENT
USE OF FORCE CHARACTERISTICS

EVALUATION OF ACTION TAKEN

*Figure G* and *Table 5* has data associated with the action taken by a supervisor, review board or chief following the use of force by each officer. Most (98.6%) incidents were reported as being Policy Compliant. The number of dispositions is slightly higher than the number of uses of force by officers due to the fact that some policy compliant cases were also recommended for additional training or counseling. The incident count for UoF dispositions is slightly higher than the total incident count for the same reason.

**FIGURE G: DISPOSITION BREAKDOWN BY EMPLOYEE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Taken</th>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>Tier 2</th>
<th>Tier 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAE for training purposes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Compliance</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to Internal Affairs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total:</strong></td>
<td>405</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>601</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FORCE ANALYSIS

Tracking the type of force used is critical to evaluating if current practices among officers is having the intended outcome when dealing with subjects. **Table 6** provides a detail of types of force used for each tier. In 2018, nine incidents were Tier 3. They are comprised of eight uses of deadly force and one incident with multiple uses of force that were included with a Tier 3 use of force. **Table 6** reflects every type of force for each subject involved in an incident.

**TABLE 6. TIER 1 & TIER 2/3 TYPE OF FORCE OCCURENCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier 3</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baton</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carotid Control Hold</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control techniques</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadly force (firearm)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobble</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal weapons</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taser</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Tier 3</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier 2</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 gauge sock round</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carotid Control Hold</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control techniques (Tier 2)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobble</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Other restraints</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other launcherable munitions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.C. (pepper spray)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal weapons</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIT maneuvers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police K-9 (Deployments '17=1320 / '18=1289)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taser</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total tier 2</strong></td>
<td>252</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baton used for leverage or push</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control techniques</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobble</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Personal weapons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other restraints</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total tier 1</strong></td>
<td>478</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please note that the uses of force exceed the total incident counts due to the possibility of multiple uses of force per incident.*
TYPE OF OFFENSE

_Figure H_ and _Table 7_ the kind of offense that each subject was contacted by police for in each use of force incident. They are presented by subject because more than one person could be contacted for different reasons within the same incident.

**FIGURE H. TYPE OF OFFENSE PERCENTAGE BY SUBJECT**

![Pie chart showing percentage of offenses by type: Felony 30.6%, Misdemeanor 63.9%, Protective Custody 4.9%, Petty Offense 0.5%, Other 0.2%.]

**TABLE 7. TYPE OF OFFENSE COUNT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Offense</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Felony</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misdemeanor</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Offense</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective Custody</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>612</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*"Other" incident involves a subject who escaped a PIT maneuver after fleeing for an unknown reason.*

REASON FOR FORCE

_Figure I_ shows a count of all entries associated to why force was used. Note that the total count does not equal the total number of incidents nor the total number of subjects. This is due to multiple reasons being listed per incident to support why a UoF was necessary, corresponding to each incident.

**FIGURE I. REASON FOR FORCE**

![Bar chart showing reasons for force: Necessary for Subjects Safety 210, Necessary to Defend Another 91, Necessary to Defend Officer 323, Necessary to Effect Arrest 532, Necessary to Prevent a Crime 170.]
EFFECTIVENESS OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF FORCE

*Table 7* shows the success rate of different types of force in gaining compliance from the subject. The chart shows that, in general, lower levels of force, such as control techniques are used most often and are highly effective.

**TABLE 7. EFFECTIVENESS BY USE OF FORCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Force</th>
<th>Total Uses</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Somewhat Successful</th>
<th>Unsuccessful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 Gauge Sock Round</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carotid Control Hold</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Techniques</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadly force</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobble</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Launchable Munitions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Restraints</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepper Spray (OC)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Weapons</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIT Maneuver</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Canine</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taser- Dart Probe</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taser- Stun Gun</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use of Force 2018
INJURIES

*Figure J* shows how many subjects and how many officers were injured in 2018 by incident. Both officers and subjects could be involved in multiple incidents with different outcomes.

**FIGURE J. INJURIES BY PERSON AND INCIDENT**

*“Unknown” involves a subject who escaped after a PIT maneuver with unknown injuries.*

**FIGURE K. THREE YEAR TREND: SUBJECT VS. OFFICER INJURIES**
### APPENDIX I – USE OF FORCE 2018 CALEA TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018 Use of Force</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firearm Discharge</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearm Display Only</td>
<td></td>
<td>DISPLAY NOT TRACKED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Control Weapon (Taser) Discharge</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Control Weapon (Taser) Display Only</td>
<td></td>
<td>DISPLAY NOT TRACKED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical/OC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaponless</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canine Release Only</td>
<td></td>
<td>GENDER AND RACE NOT TRACKED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canine Release and Bite</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Uses of Force</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of Suspects Receiving Non-Fatal Injuries</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of Suspects Receiving Fatal Injuries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of Incidents Resulting In Officer Injury or Death</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Use of Force Arrests</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Agency Custodial Arrests</td>
<td>2,162</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>3,055</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>1,945</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Use of Force Complaints</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weaponless uses of force include the hobble, control techniques, personal weapons and other restraints. There were an additional 28 uses of force that are not classified for CALEA purposes. They include the eleven uses of the PIT maneuver, seven uses of other launchable munitions (including the 12 gauge sock round) and ten other uses of force. Total use of force arrests equal the number of subjects for which one reason for force is “necessary to effect arrest”.

Use of Force 2018
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## APPENDIX II - USE OF FORCE TIERS

### TIER ZERO
- This is NOT considered to be a use of force per APD policy
  
  * Firearm Gun Point - @TZG
  * Less Lethal Shotgun or Projectile Launcher Weapon Point - @TZL
  * Handcuff & Release - No Charges - @TZH

**Reporting Requirements:** One CAD Entry per call no matter how many officers point weapons. No additional supervisor action required. CAD notes added to depict why weapons were pointed or a cuff and release was conducted.

### TIER ONE
- Use of Force with No or Minor Injury/Use of Restraint.

* Take Down No Injury/Minor Injury
* Use of restraints, capture pole or restraint chair to overcome resistance
* Control Techniques used to overcome physical resistance with No injury/Minor Injury
* Use of control weapons (Baton or SD) for leverage or control purposes (no strikes or thrusts)

**Reporting Requirements:** Determination to be made by supervisor, based on treatment status at time of release, if such UoF did not result in injury which required professional medical treatment. A GO is required, notification of supervisor and UoF in Electronic Tracking System is Required. Supervisor to document injuries or lack thereof and investigation to be completed by supervisor and tracked through the chain of command. Photographs of injuries or lack thereof must be taken.

### TIER TWO
- Use of weapon other than a deadly weapon to overcome resistance or when subject is injured by member's application of force and requires professional medical treatment.

* Pepper Spray
* Taser
* Lauchable Impact Weapons
* Kicks
* Carotid Control Hold
* Baton
* Police Canine
* Pitting of Vehicle
* Knees
* Strikes
* Punches
* Any injury in Tier One requiring Professional Medical Treatment

**Reporting Requirements:** Notify Supervisor, UoF Report in Electronic Tracking System completed by Supervisor with documentation & investigation. Track UoF report through chain of command for review and ultimately to the Compliance and Professional Standards Division, Division Chief. Photographs of injuries or lack thereof must be taken.

### TIER THREE
- Use of a deadly weapon, or deadly force, or potentially deadly force, regardless of any injury. It also applies to the UoF, tools or weapons, which result in hospitalization or death; or when a supervisor in conjunction with the Duty Captain, believes a use of force, weapons, or tools warrants a Tier Three notification and response.

* Use of Force/Critical Incident
* Use of Deadly Weapon
* Use of Deadly Force
* Use of Potentially Deadly Force
* Any Training Accident involving a firearm when another person is struck by a bullet and/or dies

**Reporting Requirements:** Notification initiated to member's immediate supervisor, Duty Captain immediately notify Investigations Bureau Commander. Reported in Electronic Tracking System as well. Any training accident when another person is struck by a bullet requires notification of the Duty Captain. Supervisor will NOT conduct an investigation into a Tier 3 critical incident, however, the supervisor will gather & enter sufficient information to start a UoF report in Electronic Tracking System to be tracked immediately to the Compliance & PSS Bureau Division Chief only. Photographs of injuries or lack thereof must be taken.
Use of Force Notification

Review Board

Force Classification
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INTRODUCTION

The Aurora Police Department’s mission is to make Aurora safer every day. Making Aurora safer requires ongoing evaluation of the department’s policies and procedures to ensure that they best serve the needs of the community and reduce crime. Consequently, the department conducted a significant restructure of its use of force directive, effective January 2016. Use of force (UoF) incidents are categorized into three tiers as follows:

- **TIER 1**: An application of force that simply involves physical control holds or tactics designed to gain compliance or overcome resistance. The force does not result in injury requiring professional medical treatment and does not involve the use of defensive weapons. Tier 1 UoF are reviewed up to the district deputy commander level. Some may be sent to the Force Review Board.

- **TIER 2**: An application of force involving the use of intermediary defensive weapons such as tasers, batons, personal weapons, and/or results in injury requiring professional medical treatment. Tier 2 UoF are reviewed by the Force Review Board.

- **TIER 3**: Use of a deadly weapon, or deadly force, or potentially deadly force, regardless of any injury. It also applies to the UoF, tools or weapons, which result in hospitalization or death; or when a supervisor in conjunction with the Duty Captain, believes a use of force, weapons, or tools warrants a Tier Three notification and response.

The Force Review Board (FRB) consists of a body of sworn officers that reviews all Tier 2 and Tier 3 incidents. The FRB also reviews any Tier 1 incidents that are deemed by the respective chains of command to need additional consideration. The FRB reviews these cases for compliance with applicable state statues and department directives, as well as identifying any training deficiencies.

Directive 05.04 Reporting and Investigating the Use of Tools, Weapons and Physical Force is the primary policy controlling the use of force within the police department. Directive 05.04 was revised twice in 2019. Two changes worth noting were the broadening of the Tier 3 definition, and the change to make photographs of the suspect injuries or lack thereof are now considered digital evidence to the case. Policies, practices, training and equipment are reviewed by academy staff as they prepare UoF instruction and present training for new recruits and at in-service (at least annually). The annual report, POST requirements and CALEA standards also prompt review and adjustment of policies, practices, equipment and training as necessary. The findings of this report will not effect any changes at this time.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The department tracks use of force statistics through Administrative Investigations Management (AIM) software. There were 591 Use of Force incident reports from January 1, 2019- December 31, 2019. A review of incidents has shown that departmental policies were followed in almost every use of force incident, with 98.6% of incidents closed as Policy Compliant.

*Table 1* provides the ratio of Aurora’s UoF incidents to population, percentage of population change from year-to-year and the percentage change of incidents year-to-year. For 2019, the department had a .17% decrease in UoF incidents as compared to 2018. More significantly, it had a 1.9% decrease in the ratio of incidence per 1,000 residents. This drop means that the per capita use of force is decreasing in addition to the number of actual incidents, for the third consecutive year (reported in CALEA trends and patterns). *Table 2* provides a summary of incidents by geographic district and tier level and a count whether each use of force was effective for each subject.

**TABLE 1. USE OF FORCE INCIDENT & POPULATION COMPARISON**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Incidents</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Ratio (per 1000)</th>
<th>% Change in Population</th>
<th>% Change in Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>361,103</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>+ 1.05%</td>
<td>- 12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>374,154</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>+ 3.61%</td>
<td>- 1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>384,950</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>+ 2.89%</td>
<td>- .17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 2. USE OF FORCE BY TIERS, DISTRICT & SUCCESS RATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident by District</th>
<th>Incidents by Tier</th>
<th>Effectiveness(^1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 2</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside City Jurisdiction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- There were no noticeable trends in the incidents per tier level over the past 3 years.
- The highest number of the incidents (65) occurred in August. This is consistent with 2017, but not 2018.
- The highest number of incidents (347) occurred on the swing shift from 1500-0100. This is consistent with the prior two years.
- The highest number of incidents occurred on Fridays and Saturdays (94 and 101 respectively); however, incidents were mostly evenly spread throughout the week. This is consistent with the prior two years.

\(^1\) Effectiveness statistics reflect each separate use of force for each subject involved in an incident.
Figure A\(^2\) below provides a graphical summary of incidents by patrol district and beat, except for four incidents that occurred outside the city jurisdiction (OCJ). The average count of incidents per patrol beat was 23, with the highest numbers in District 2 beats 12 and 15. The proportion of incidents per district has been stable over the past three years, except for a notable jump (6%) in incidents in District 2 in 2019. This jump is consistent with increase in criminal activity in this district, including a 13% increase in violent crimes, a 10.6% increase in major index crimes and a 6.8% increase in total arrests, over 2018. Districts 1 and 3, by comparison, have had decreases in major violent crimes and total arrests, as well as held steady and decreased, respectively, in major index crime\(^3\). One factor to consider is that Aurora is expanding in District 2 to encompass new housing and the new hotel and convention center Gaylord over the Rockies. District 1, which encompasses the most beats, still has the highest total numbers of incidents.

FIGURE A. USE OF FORCE BY DISTRICT & BEAT

---

\(^2\) The figures and tables presented in this report are all conclusions based on the use of force report fields exported from the Administrative Investigations Management (AIM) program.

\(^3\) Data from 2019 Year-end NIBRS report
DEMOGRAPHICS OF INCIDENTS

OFFICERS

There were 1311 officers involved in uses of force in 2019. Officers were counted each time they were involved in an incident, and most incidents involved multiple officers. There were 393 officers involved in one or more incidents, and each officer was involved in an average of three incidents. Table 3 shows that the demographic breakdown for officers involved in use of force incidents closely reflects the demographics of the department’s sworn staff, indicating that the gender or race of the officer is not a factor that influences the use force.

The average years of service is trending slightly downward, from 8.7 in 2017 to 7 in 2019. This is likely due to the trend of the department having an increased number of newer officers, and not due to any changes in training for newer recruits. There was a downward trend in average years of service for the entire department, from 14.8 years 2017 to 12.5 years in 2019. The Department increased its lateral and basic recruit academies from two to four in 2018, which accounts for the increase in newer officers.

TABLE 3: OFFICER DEMOGRAPHICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Use of Force Sworn Staff</th>
<th>All Sworn Staff</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Use of Force Sworn Staff</th>
<th>All Sworn Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td>.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two or more Races</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Officers are counted each time they are involved in a separate incident, and each incident can involve multiple officers. A total of 393 officers were involved in Use of Force incidents in 2019.

5 This column for gender and race reflects demographics of staff involved in a use of force.

6 This column for gender and race reflects the sworn staff of the entire department, whether or not they were involved in force. Data on all sworn staff from personnel system APPs as of 12/31/19
SUBJECTS

Subjects involved: 611 | Average age = 31

There were 611 subjects involved in use of force incidents. Subjects who were involved in multiple incidents were counted each time, but most subjects were involved in only one incident. There were 584 people involved in only one incident, twelve involved in two and one person involved in three incidents. The average age of the subject was 31, which is consistent with the three prior years. Demographics for the current year subject demographics are found in Figures B-C and Tables 4-6, while three-year trends are shown in Figures D-E.

TABLE 4: SUBJECT DEMOGRAPHICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Use of Force Population</th>
<th>Aurora Population8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Arab</td>
<td>.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two or more Races</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE B. USE OF FORCE PERCENTAGE BY SUBJECT RACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>611</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Subjects are counted each time they are involved in a separate incident, and each incident can involve multiple subjects.
8 From 2018 American Community Survey 5-year Estimate [https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/auroracitycolorado](https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/auroracitycolorado)
### TABLE 6. SUBJECT RACE BREAKDOWN BY DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
<th>Outside City Jurisdiction (OCJ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more Races</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>276</strong></td>
<td><strong>234</strong></td>
<td><strong>97</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FIGURE C. USE OF FORCE AGE COUNT BY SUBJECT GENDER AT AGE OF THE TIME OF THE INCIDENT

[Graph showing count of age by gender and district]
FIGURE D. THREE-YEAR TREND: SUBJECT GENDER BREAKDOWN

FIGURE E. THREE YEAR TREND: USE OF FORCE PERCENTAGE BY SUBJECT RACE
USE OF FORCE CHARACTERISTICS

TYPE OF OFFENSE

Figure F and Table 7 show the kind of offense that each subject was contacted by police for in each use of force incident. They are presented by subject because more than one person could be contacted for different reasons within the same incident.

FIGURE F. TYPE OF OFFENSE PERCENTAGE BY SUBJECT

TABLE 7. TYPE OF OFFENSE COUNT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Offense</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Felony</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misdemeanor</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Offense</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective Custody</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>611</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The “other” type of offense refers to a subject who fit the description of a crime suspect but turned out not to be the suspect. Therefore, no offense was committed prior to police contact.
REASON FOR FORCE

*Figures G and H* show the reasons associated to why force was used by count and percentage. Note that the total count does not equal the total number of incidents nor the total number of subjects. This is due to multiple reasons being listed per incident to support why a UoF was necessary, corresponding to each incident. Most uses of force were necessary to overcome resistance to arrest, except for Tier 3 level force, which was primarily used for the safety of the officer.

**FIGURE G. REASON FOR FORCE BY TOTAL COUNT**

**FIGURE H. REASON FOR FORCE BY TIER**
**EVALUATION OF ACTION TAKEN**

*Figures I and J* show the action taken by a supervisor, review board or chief following the use of force by each officer. Most (98.6%) incidents were reported as being Policy Compliant. The number of dispositions is slightly higher than the number of uses of force by officers because some policy compliant cases were also recommended for additional training or counseling. The incident count for UoF dispositions is slightly higher than the total incident count for the same reason.

**FIGURE I. DISPOSITION BY EMPLOYEE**

**TABLE 8. DISPOSITION BY EMPLOYEE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disposition</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrective Action</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Compliance</td>
<td>1296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to IA</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1314</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE J. DISPOSITION BY INCIDENT AND TIER**
FORCE ANALYSIS

Tracking the type of force used is critical to evaluating if current practices among officers is having the intended outcome when dealing with subjects. Table 9 provides a detail of types of force used for each tier. In 2019, there were 832 separate uses of force in 591 incidents involving 611 subjects. Some incidents had multiple uses of force. In most Tier 1 incidents, officers were able to gain compliance with minimal application of force. Of the 437 subjects involved in Tier 1 incidents, all but 53 became compliant after a single application of force, and only two subjects of the 53 required a third application of force.

For Tier 2 incidents, 161 of 165 subjects involved required multiple applications of force, which reflects the officers’ strategy of responding with the lowest level of force possible and escalating only if it is unsuccessful. Nine incidents were Tier 3. They are comprised of five uses of deadly force and two incidents with multiple uses of force that culminated in deadly force, and four incidents that were Tier 3 because of the level of injury sustained by the subjects. Table 9 reflects every type of force for each subject involved in an incident.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 9. TYPE OF FORCE OCCURRENCES BY TIER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier 3</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-gauge sock round</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carotid Control Hold</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control techniques</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadly force (firearm)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobble</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other lauchable munitions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal weapons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police K9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taser</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tier 3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier 2</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-gauge sock round</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carotid Control Hold</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control techniques (Tier 2)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobble</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Other restraints</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other lauchable munitions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.C. (pepper spray)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal weapons</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIT maneuvers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police K9 (Deployments '18=1,289 / '19=1,282)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taser</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tier 2</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
EFFECTIVENESS OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF FORCE

Table 10 shows the success rate of different types of force in gaining compliance from the subject. The chart shows that, in general, lower levels of force, such as control techniques are used most often and are highly effective. The Taser is the least effective. A possible explanation is that the Taser barbs must contact the subject to work, and bulky clothing, such as a winter coat, can get in the way. In 2019, APD did away with the “Somewhat successful” category of effectiveness, due to it being overly vague. The elimination of this category accounts for some of the increase of both successful and unsuccessful outcomes over 2018. Figure K. show the three-year trend of outcomes.

TABLE 10. EFFECTIVENESS BY USE OF FORCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Force</th>
<th>Total Uses</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Unsuccessful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 Gauge Sock Round</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carotid Control Hold</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Techniques</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadly force</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobble</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Launchable Munitions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Restraints</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepper Spray (OC)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Weapons</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Canine</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taser- Dart Probe</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taser- Stun Gun</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE K. THREE YEAR TREND: EFFECTIVENESS OF FORCE

INJURIES

*Figure L.* shows how many subjects and how many officers were injured in 2019 by incident. Both officers and subjects could be involved in multiple incidents with different outcomes. *Figure M.* compares the rate of injury for officers to the rate of injury to subjects for the past three years. The number of subjects injured is in line with previous years, but officer injuries increase by almost 11% in 2019.
FIGURE M. THREE YEAR TREND: SUBJECT VS. OFFICER INJURIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% of Subjects Injured</th>
<th>% of Officers Injured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX I – USE OF FORCE 2019 CALEA TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019 Use of Force</th>
<th>White Non-Hispanic</th>
<th>Black Non-Hispanic</th>
<th>Hispanic Latino Any Race</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearm Discharge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearm Display Only</td>
<td>DISPLAY NOT TRACKED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Control Weapon (Taser) Discharge</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Control Weapon (Taser) Display Only</td>
<td>DISPLAY NOT TRACKED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical/OC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaponless(^{10})</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canine Release Only</td>
<td>GENDER AND RACE NOT TRACKED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canine Release and Bite</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Uses of Force</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of Suspects Receiving Non-Fatal Injuries</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of Suspects Receiving Fatal Injuries</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of Incidents Resulting In Officer Injury or Death</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Use of Force Arrests(^{11})</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Agency Custodial Arrests</td>
<td>1,934</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>2,898</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Use of Force Complaints</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{10}\) Weaponless uses of force include the hobble, control techniques, personal weapons, carotid control hold and other restraints. There were an additional 23 uses of force that are not classified for CALEA purposes, for a total of 832 uses of force. They include fifteen uses of other launchable munitions (including the 12 gauge sock round) and eight other uses of force.

\(^{11}\) “Use of force arrests” are the subjects for which one reason for force is “necessary to effect arrest”.

\(^{12}\) “The White custodial arrests” category includes 83 white subjects of unknown ethnicity, including 60 males and 23 females.
APPENDIX II - USE OF FORCE TIERS

TIER ONE - Use of Force with No or Minor Injury/Use of Restraint.
* Take Down No Injury/Minor Injury
* Use of restraints, capture pole or restraint chair to overcome resistance
* Control Techniques used to overcome physical resistance with No injury/Minor Injury
* Use of control weapons (Baton or SD-1) for leverage or control purposes (no strikes or thrusts)

**Reporting Requirements:** Determination to be made by supervisor, based on treatment status at time of release, if such UoF did not result in injury which required professional medical treatment. A GO is required, notification of supervisor and UoF in Electronic Tracking System is Required. Supervisor to document injuries or lack thereof and investigation to be completed by supervisor and tracked through the chain of command. Photographs of injuries or lack thereof must be taken.

TIER TWO - Use of weapon other than a deadly weapon to overcome resistance or when subject is injured by member’s application of force and requires professional medical treatment.
* Pepper Spray  
* Taser  
* Lauchable Impact Weapons  
* Kicks  
* Carotid Control Hold  
* Baton  
* Police Canine  
* Pitting of Vehicle  
* Knees  
* Strikes  
* Any injury in Tier One requiring Professional Medical Treatment

**Reporting Requirements:** Notify Supervisor, UoF Report in Electronic Tracking System completed by Supervisor with documentation & investigation. Track UoF report through chain of command for review and ultimately to the Compliance and Professional Standards Division, Division Chief. Photographs of injuries or lack thereof must be taken.

TIER THREE - Use of a deadly weapon, or deadly force, or potentially deadly force, regardless of any injury. It also applies to the UoF, tools or weapons, which result in hospitalization or death; or when a supervisor in conjunction with the Duty Captain, believes a use of force, weapons, or tools warrants a Tier Three notification and response.
* Use of Force/Critical Incident  
* Use of Deadly Weapon  
* Use of Deadly Force  
* Use of Potentially Deadly Force  
* Use of force, tools or weapons which results in hospitalization or death  
* When a supervisor in conjunction with Duty Captain believes UoF, weapons or tools warrants a Tier 3 notification & response  
* Any Training Accident involving a firearm when another person is struck by a bullet and/or dies

**Reporting Requirements:** Notification initiated to member’s immediate supervisor, Duty Captain immediately notify Investigations Bureau Commander. Reported in Electronic Tracking System as well. Any training accident when another person is struck by a bullet requires notification of the Duty Captain. Supervisor will NOT conduct an investigation into a Tier 3 critical incident, however, the supervisor will gather & enter sufficient information to start a UoF report in Electronic Tracking System to be tracked immediately to the Compliance & PSS Bureau Division Chief only. Photographs of injuries or lack thereof must be taken.
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ABSTRACT

Several high-profile news stories have linked post-September 11 (9/11) combat service to violent crime among veterans. Nevertheless, there is scant causal evidence for this claim. We exploit the administrative procedures by which U.S. Armed Forces senior commanders conditionally randomly assign active duty servicemen to overseas deployments to estimate the causal impact of modern warfare on crime. Using data from two national surveys and a unified framework, we find consistent evidence that post-9/11 combat service substantially increased the probability of crime commission among veterans. Combat increases the likelihood of property and violent crime, arrest, gang membership, trouble with police, and punishment under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. Back-of-the-envelope calculations suggest that post-9/11 combat exposure generated approximately $26.7 billion in additional crime costs. Finally, we document descriptive evidence that Traumatic Brain Injury and Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) may be important mechanisms to explain post-9/11 combat-induced increases in crime.
“[P]eople in war had so inured themselves to corrupt and wicked manners had taken a
delight and pleasure in robbing and stealing, that through manslaughter they had gathered
boldness to mischief, that their laws were held in contempt, and nothing set by or
regarded.”

- Sir Thomas Moore, Utopia, 1516

“The [unit’s] soldiers who survived all exhibited signs of posttraumatic stress disorder and
other psychological conditions. Twelve of them have been arrested for murder or attempted
murder.”

- U.S. Supreme Court Justice Sonia Sotomayor,
  Lockhart v. Alabama, 2015

1. Introduction

Approximately 181,500 veterans are incarcerated in the United States, representing 8
percent of the prison and jail populations (Bronson et al. 2015). Many are veterans of wars
waged in the Global War on Terrorism (GWOT), launched in the wake of the September 11,
2001 attacks on the United States. Thirteen percent of currently incarcerated veterans served in
the Afghanistan or Iraq conflicts and approximately 45,000 incarcerated veterans were exposed
to combat during their war deployments. While the incarceration rate for veterans is nearly 10
percent lower than for civilians (855 per 100,000 veterans compared to 986 per 100,000 U.S.
citizens), a far greater share of incarcerated veterans has been sentenced for violent offenses (64
percent versus 48 percent) (Bronson et al. 2015). Surveys of post-9/11 veterans suggest that
approximately one-third have exhibited non-job-related physical aggression and a further 11
percent engaged in “severe or lethal violence” (Elbogen et al. 2012).

High-profile incidents of violence committed by post-9/11 veterans, including aggravated
assaults (Simkins 2018) and mass shootings (Keneally 2018), have permeated the national news
media. The link between modern warfare and violence has been tied to historically high rates of
Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI), and substance abuse
among combat veterans deployed during GWOT (Tanielian and Jaycox 2008; Cesur et al.
2019).1

---

1 See Elboge (2012), MacManus et al. (2013), and Cesur and Sabia (2016) for a discussion of the link between
“invisible wounds of war” and subsequent violence.
Isolating the causal effect of modern war service on crime is a challenging task due to endogenous selection into the military. Prior studies of the effect of U.S. military service on crime have used draft lottery assignment to generate exogenous variation in wartime service (Rohlfs 2010; Lindo and Stroeker 2014). However, the abolition of the U.S. draft lottery in January 1973, followed by a transition to all-volunteer Armed Forces (AVFs), necessitates an alternative identification strategy. Moreover, from a policy perspective, in the absence of a return to the draft, a more relevant comparison group may be necessary to evaluate the crime costs of waging of modern warfare.

There are a number of reasons why the effect of modern warfare on crime may differ from prior draft-era conflicts. First, the marginal fighter has changed in ways that could exacerbate or dampen the effects of war service on crime (Sabia and Skimmyhorn 2019). AVFs are drawn from less socially connected and more disadvantaged populations than conscripted forces (Elder et al. 2010; Laich and Wilkerson 2017), traits that may generate larger adverse effects of war service. On the other hand, if volunteers are better matched to job duties than conscripted civilians, they may face lower private costs of fighting a war, generating smaller impacts on crime. Moreover, there is evidence that those who selected into combat occupations during the Afghanistan and Iraq wars were more likely to be drawn from white and higher-income neighborhoods (Carter et al. 2017), factors that could be protective, and therefore mute crime effects.

In addition, the nature of modern warfare itself has changed in ways that could alter the effect of war service on crime. First, modern military training techniques, which include more effective and depersonalized killing strategies such as unmanned drones, may more easily enable servicemembers to overcome their resistance to kill other human beings (Grossman 2009).^2^

---

^2^ For example, while those trained to fight previous wars such as the Second World War did shoot at bullseye targets, in more recent times the training of military personnel shifted to use of more realistic targets such as a photo of a human being or silhouette, or even use of a video simulator (Grossman 2009). According to the British Broadcasting Company (BBC):

“[Military training] methods are perfected, increasingly directed to reducing inhibitions. This is one of the reasons why simulation systems are in use in many countries today, and the soldiers themselves are the targets. The soldier, his weapon, the vehicles - as much as possible, is electronically networked. This creates a pseudo-realistic situation - the soldiers shoot straight at their comrades, who are acting as ‘enemies.’ The aim is desensitization with a view to future reality.” (BBC 2015, https://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-30573936.
Hence, modern combat training may more easily condition post-9/11 veterans to engage in violent behavior both while in war theatre and their post-separation lives.

Second, post-9/11 military engagements in Iraq and Afghanistan often took the form of “asymmetric warfare” in which enemies of vastly inferior military strength employed remotely detonated improvised explosive devices (IEDs), roadside bombs, and mines (Congressional Research Service 2007; Wallace 2009; Thornton 2007; Wilson 2007; Buffaloe 2006) against U.S. and allied forces. While casualty rates in these modern conflicts were substantially lower than in draft-era conflicts (Sabia and Skimmyhorn 2019), the nature of injuries among those who have survived asymmetric warfare changed significantly.3 In particular, TBI became the signature injury of GWOT (McKee and Robinson 2014; Hoge et al. 2008; Okie 2005), affecting over 17 percent of post-9/11 veterans (Lindquist et al. 2011). TBI has been linked to substantial declines in cognitive skills and social interactions (Lash 2015; National Research Council 2008; Zoroya 2007), factors that may exacerbate the risk of crime (Elbogen et al. 2012; Williams et al. 2018). Furthermore, nearly 20 percent of post-9/11 veterans suffered “invisible wounds of war” (Tanielian and Jaycox 2008; Hoge et al. 2004), which has been linked to increased hostility (Jakupcak et al. 2007) and violence (Orcutt et al. 2003; Taft et al. 2005; Cesur and Sabia 2016) among veterans (Sreenivasan et al. 2013).4

Third, in part due to the heavy psychological toll that modern warfare has taken on veterans, there is strong evidence that post-9/11 combat deployments are linked to substance use disorders, including heavy episodic alcohol use (Seal et al. 2011; Wilk et al. 2010; Teeters et al. 2017; Cesur et al. 2017) and opioid addiction (Cesur et al. 2019). Accordingly, combat-induced addiction may generate more property crime for income-generating purposes, as well as more violent crime through addiction-induced reductions in inhibitions or increases in discount rates.

Fourth, modern warfare has had a more negative effect on veterans’ schooling and labor market outcomes than prior conflicts. There is evidence to indicate that draft exposure in prior conflicts increased veterans’ educational attainment (Lemieux and Card 2001; Angrist 1993; Stanley 2003; Barr 2015), driven by the availability of generous schooling benefits under the GI Bill. In contrast, post-9/11 combat deployments and modern warfare had negative effects on

---

3 Advances in military medicine, evacuation techniques, and body armor have resulted in a casualty rate for GWOT-era service that is 70 percent lower than in draft-era wars (Fischer 2015; Fazal 2014; Stiglitz and Bilmes 2008; Physicians for Social Responsibility 2006).

4 See Glenn et al. (2002), Jakupcak et al. (2007), and Gartner and Kennedy (2018) for additional evidence.
education, particularly for those exposed to casualties among members of their units, and employment among separating veterans (Sabia and Skimmyhorn 2019). These declines in schooling and labor force attachment may generate larger increases in crime (Lin 2008; Fone et al. 2019; Lochner and Moretti 2004; Machin et al. 2011) than was seen from prior wars.\(^5\)

Finally, modern veterans’ benefits programs could differently affect combat veterans’ propensity for crime. Large entitlement benefits programs provided by the Department of Veteran Affairs (VA) to post-9/11 veterans — including the Veterans Disability Compensation (VDC) program, Unemployment Compensation for Ex-Servicemembers (UCX), the Post-9/11 GI Bill, and Transition Assistance Programs (TAPs) — may reduce the propensity to engage in income-generating illegal activities by providing a more generous social safety net.\(^6\) On the other hand, unintended consequences of many modern veterans’ entitlements programs, such as work disincentives generated by the Veterans Disability Compensation program (VDC) (Angrist et al. 2010; Autor et al. 2010, 2016), could increase veteran idleness and reduce their social connectedness (Gade et al. 2013), potentially resulting in more crime. In summary, the impact of post-9/11 combat on crime is, a priori, ambiguous, and remains an empirical question.

This study provides new evidence on the impact of modern warfare on crime among veterans. We exploit the administrative procedures by which senior commanders assign active-duty servicemembers to overseas deployments to estimate the causal impact of post-9/11 combat deployments on crime. Because U.S. Armed Forces Human Resources Command treats servicemen of identical military rank and occupation as perfect substitutes for the purposes of unit deployment assignments, the natural experiment we propose is able to mimic conditional random assignment.

Using data from the military module of the 2007-2008 National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health) and the 2008 Department of Defense Survey of Health and Related Behaviors Among Active Duty Personnel (HRBS), we find that post-9/11 combat deployments substantially increased the risk of crime. Increases in violent crime appear largest for those who were exposed to enemy firefight during combat deployments. Furthermore, we

---

5 Additionally, as with previous wars, military deployments may decrease men's wages (Angrist 1990, 1998; Angrist and Krueger 1994), which could have similar effects on crime.

6 Moreover, the quality of mental health services provided by the Veterans Health Administration is relatively high (Mantorell and Bergman 2013), and AVF veterans are more likely to seek help for mental health distress than their conscripted counterparts from prior wars (Stiglitz and Bilmes 2008), each of which may mute the effect of post-9/11 combat-induced psychological harm on crime.
document that combat exposure increases the probability that a veteran joins a gang, has trouble with military or civilian police, is arrested, and faces punishment under the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ). These effects are largest among enlisted servicemen under the age of 33. The magnitudes of our estimates suggest that post-9/11 combat exposure generated substantial crime costs to society: approximately $26.4 billion in additional costs for violent crime and $315 million in costs for property crime (in 2018 dollars). Auxiliary analyses reveal TBI and PTSD as likely mechanisms through which the identified relationship may be operating.

2. Background

Criminal activity following combat deployments are dealt with by military law, administered via the UCMJ or by civilian courts. We begin by describing these procedures.

2.1 Crime During Active Duty

Active-duty servicemembers are subject to the UCMJ for criminal offenses committed while on active duty or, in the case of reservists, when performing a duty that is directly related to their reservist status (United States Code, Title 10, Subtitle A, Part II, Chapter 47, Article 2). The UCMJ outlines expectations for servicemembers’ standards of conduct, procedures that govern the adjudication of alleged conduct violations, and possible sanctions for those violations.⁷

Reports of servicemembers’ alleged UCMJ violations are typically brought to their commanders’ attention by a commissioned officer, warrant officer, petty officer, or noncommissioned officer. Once apprehended, a member of command authority may confine the member in military jail or impose restrictions on servicemembers movements (i.e., on post or base). Unlike civilian courts where a district attorney decides to press charges, under the UCMJ, senior commanders make this decision. Servicemembers have a right against self-incrimination and are entitled to be informed of the suspected offense(s) before being questioned by an officer (UCMJ Article 31). If the offense is one that warrants a general court-martial, the prosecutor

⁷ Article I Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution, ratified in 1789, gave the U.S. Congress the authority to regulate conduct in the Armed Forces. The UCMJ was passed by the U.S. Congress on May 5, 1950, and signed into law by President Truman on the following day. This law established the modern U.S. military justice system, which covers all service branches of the Armed Forces and governing behavior of active-duty personnel, reservists, those in custody, and those serving with (and employed by) the Armed Forces (Article 2 UCMJ).
must be a military lawyer (judge advocate), and an appointed military lawyer may defend the accused servicemember.

Courts-martial may take three forms. In a summary court-martial, a single commissioned officer acting as judge and jury generally presides over cases reserved for lesser infractions such as simple assaults, failing to properly salute a superior officer, or abandoning watch. Punishments typically involve confinement, forfeiture of pay, and reduction of pay to lowest pay grade (United States Code, Title 10, Subtitle A, Part II, Chapter 47, Article 17). A special court-martial, adjudicated by a military judge and four members of a jury, generally hears more serious cases such as those involving issuing false statements, weapons violations, drug possession, and disrespect toward a superior commissioned officer (Court Martial Reports 2019; Navy Trial Results 2019). Punishments are more severe than those handed down from summary courts-martial and also include bad conduct discharges. Finally, a general court-martial — which adjudicates the most serious cases dealing with larceny of military property, assault, rape, espionage, war crimes and murder (Court Martial Reports 2019; Navy Results of Trial 2019) — includes a military judge, the accused, prosecuting and defense attorneys, and a panel of at least five members (United States Code, Title 10, Subtitle A, Part II, Chapter 47). For general courts-martial, which handles the most serious charges, punishments can include the death penalty, imprisonment for life, and dishonorable discharge from the Armed Forces. Between 2001 and 2010, there were 69,272 courts-martial across all branches of the Armed Services with the number of courts-martial remaining steady or slightly declining (U.S. Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces 2019).

Minor offenses such as non-alcohol-related traffic law violations, lateness to meetings, and disobeying minor orders are generally not handled via courts-martial, but rather with non-judicial punishments (NJPs) under Article 15 of the UCMJ. Article 15 NJPs are seen as corrections to misconduct without the stigma of a court-martial with a two-year statute of limitations. Disciplinary punishments that can be imposed under Article 15 generally involve

---

8 For instance, the following punishments are prohibited in such cases: death, dismissal, dishonorable or bad conduct discharge, confinement for more than one month, hard-labor without confinement for more than 45 days, restriction to specified limits for more than two months, and forfeiture of more than two-thirds of one month’s pay (United States Code, Title 10, Subtitle A, Part II, Chapter 47, Article 17).
9 For general courts-martial, any punishment not forbidden by this chapter, including the penalty of death when specifically authorized by this chapter (United States Code, Title 10, Subtitle A, Part II, Chapter 47, Article 17).
10 Servicemembers have the right to demand a court-martial for these charges if they wish to have a formal trial.
forfeiture of pay, restriction to base or ship, a reprimand, and specific punishments dependent on rank.\(^{11}\) From 2000 through 2010, there were between 65,000 and 80,000 Article 15 punishments imposed throughout all service branches (U.S. Court of Appeal for the Armed Forces 2019).

A limited class of offenses is only prosecutable and punishable by military law, such as insubordination, failure to obey an order, sedition, and mutiny (UCMJ Articles 91, 92, 94).\(^{12}\) However, some offenses committed while a servicemember is on active duty such as driving under the influence (DUI), assault, robbery, and murder (Urbanic Law 2017; Military DUI: Court Martial and Civilian Charges 2016), can be tried by both military and (state) civilian courts.\(^{13}\)

2.2 Post-Separation Crime

Following active duty service, trials of veterans’ crimes are largely handled by state and federal courts (Ziezulewicz 2017). Several high-profile national media stories following criminal trials have linked post-9/11 combat service to violence. For example, a 2008 New York Times article highlighted 121 homicide cases committed by Iraq and Afghanistan veterans (Sontag and Alvarez 2008). Burchett et al. (2008) examined the facts behind these cases and documented that 90 percent of the individuals had served in Iraq, with approximately 40 percent exposed to combat. Also, stories appearing in major media outlets such as the Chicago Tribune, Los Angeles Times, and New York Times have linked post-9/11 service to mass shootings.\(^{14}\)

Substantial numbers of PTSD-linked offenses coupled with a growth in post-9/11 veteran engagement with the criminal justice system have prompted the establishment of veterans’ treatment courts (VTCs) in over 500 counties across the United States (Douds and Hummer

---

\(^{11}\) Enlisted personnel can include such actions as a reduction in rank, forfeiture of pay (up to one-half of one month's pay per month for two months), restriction to base or the ship (up to 60 days), extra duties, correctional custody (up to 30 days), and a reprimand. For officers, permissible punishments can include forfeiture of pay (up to one-half of one month’s pay per month for two months), restriction to base or the ship (up to 60 days), arrest in quarters (up to 30 days), and a reprimand. (United States Code, Title 10, Subtitle A, Part II, Chapter 47, Article 15).

\(^{12}\) Adultery, fraternization, straggling, wearing unauthorized insignia, decoration, badge, ribbon, device, or lapel button, all fall under Article 134. These infractions can lead to punishments via Article 15 or courts-martial, depending on the implications of the offense.

\(^{13}\) A servicemember subject to a military court trial cannot be tried for the same offense in federal court (Grafton v. the United States 1907).

\(^{14}\) See, for example, the following news stories from the New York Times, the Chicago Tribune, and the Los Angeles Times: https://www.nytimes.com/2018/11/08/us/shooting-california-thousand-oaks.html
VTCs are a hybrid of mental health and drug courts. Veterans selected for admission to a VTC are given an opportunity to complete an individualized treatment program — which requires regular court appearances, participation in treatment sessions, and random drug testing — in exchange for avoiding incarceration (National Center for State Courts 2012; Tsai et al. 2016).15,16

2.3 Prior Literature on the Relationship between the Military Draft and Crime

Much of the economics literature examining the impact of military service on crime has used the draft lottery to generate exogenous variation in service. This approach identifies the effects of service (due to draft) on the criminal behavior of a civilian who is “randomly” drawn into military service. The results of these studies are mixed across countries, conflicts, and whether military service occurs during peacetime or wartime.

Rohlfs (2010) exploits heterogeneity in draft lottery risk across U.S. birth cohorts to estimate the impact of Vietnam War-era military service on crime. Using data from the National Vietnam Veterans Readjustment Study (NVVRS) and U.S. Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC), he finds that exposure to the Vietnam draft was associated with a reduction in crime rates while servicemembers were on active duty, consistent with an incapacitation effect. However, following their return, exposure to the draft lottery was associated with an 8 to 16 incident per year increase in violent acts committed by African Americans. For whites, however, the estimated effect on violent crime was smaller and statistically indistinguishable from zero (1 to 1.5 incidents per year). Based on these findings, Rohlfs (2010) estimates that waging the Vietnam war generated approximately $65 billion in additional crime costs (in 2007 dollars).

While there is state-level heterogeneity in eligibility for VTCs (Jaafari 2019; Timko et al. 2017), deferments to these courts are generally reserved for non-violent offenders who have suffered deployment-related psychological trauma (Brummet 2013). Still, surveys of VTC eligibility criteria suggest that 62 percent of VTCs will not entirely rule out violent offenders when determining veteran court eligibility (Flatley et al. 2017). Domestic violence appears to be the most common violent crime that will not necessarily disqualify a veteran from a VTC.

Studies on the effectiveness of VTCs on recidivism have been hampered by the lack of exogenous variation in the assignment. The literature has mainly been descriptive and either compared VTC participants with VJO-engaged non-participants and controlled for observable differences between the two groups (Blue-Howells et al. 2013) or examined only VTC participants and relied on a before-after estimator (Tsai et al. 2016). Unsurprisingly, the findings from these studies are mixed, though there is some evidence that VTC participation is positively related to the probability of recidivism, which the authors interpret as a consequence of enhanced monitoring (Tsai et al. 2016).
Lindo and Stroecker (2014) also study the Vietnam conflict, but obtain data on the exact birth date of inmates to identify individual risk probabilities for the draft. Combining data from 1979, 1989, and 1991 Surveys of Inmates in State and Federal Correctional Facilities (SISFCF) with data from the Vital Statistics of the United States (VSUS), the authors create measures of incarceration probabilities for each day of birth for cohorts affected by Vietnam era draft lotteries. These data are then supplemented with 1983-1991 prison admissions data from the National Corrections Reporting Program (NCRP) and U.S. Census data from 2000 to estimate the effect of the Vietnam era military service on incarceration. Two-sample instrumental variable estimates show that military service increased the incarceration probability for a violent crime by 0.34 percentage points, but decreased the probability of confinement for a nonviolent crime by 0.30 percentage points. The authors explain this finding by suggesting that military service does not change an individual's propensity to commit a crime, but instead may cause them to commit more-severe crimes involving violence.

Siminski et al. (2014) study the impact of the Vietnam draft on crimes committed by Australian men using cross-cohort differences in exposure to the draft. Using administrative data on (i) birth dates for the universe of Australian male cohorts who were draft-eligible, and (ii) criminal court cases in the three largest Australian states (New South Wales, Victoria, and Queensland) between 1994-2010, the authors find no evidence that draft-induced military service increased the probability of violent or non-violent crime. The estimates are sufficiently precise that, with 95 percent confidence, the authors can rule out crime rate changes of larger than 11 percent in response to military service. Siminski et al. (2014) argue that differences in the effects of Vietnam war exposure for Australian as compared to U.S. combat veterans can be explained by Australia’s Vietnam military training programs preparing recruits for a war of covert counterinsurgency rather than large-scale conventional battles.17

Other studies have examined the effect of military service across periods that include both peacetime and wartime service. Galiani et al. (2011) study the crime effects of conscription in Argentina between 1901 and 1995.18 Using data from the Argentine Ministry of Justice, the

---

17 Specifically, the authors argue that counterinsurgency training may be less realistic and, therefore, less desensitizing than conventional war training (Anderson and Rees 2015).
18 Wars during this period included the Revolution of 1905, Revolución Libertadora in 1955, the 1963 Argentine Navy Revolt, the far-leftist insurgency of 1970-1979, Operativo Independencia in 1975-1977, the Falklands War (Malvinas War) in 1982, and the 1990 Gulf War.
authors find that conscription increased the likelihood of subsequent prosecutions and incarcerations among veterans of both peacetime and wartime military service. Across both types of service, IV estimates show that military service raises the probability of incarceration by 4 percent.

Albæk et al. (2017) use longitudinal administrative data from Denmark, which link draft records with the educational, labor market, and criminal records of the 1964 birth cohort, to estimate the effect of peacetime military service on crime. The authors find that conscripted peacetime service reduced property crime among youths by 18 percent in the year of military enlistment, and by 10 to 14 percent in each of the subsequent three years. They find no evidence that violent crime was affected by peacetime service in either the short- or long-run. Albæk et al. (2017) conclude that because there are no education or labor market effects of military service, the property crime reductions they detect can be explained by other channels, such as changing tastes toward crime.

Finally, Lyk-Jensen (2018) also study the military draft in Denmark using longitudinal administrative data. However, she examines a wider set of birth cohorts (1976 through 1983) than considered in Albæk et al. (2017) and finds no evidence that peacetime military service affected property or violent crime.

2.4 Post-9/11 War Deployments and Crime

Only one study of which we are aware has credibly estimated the impact of post-9/11 military deployments on crime. Anderson and Rees (2015) exploit the timing of overseas unit deployments among post-9/11 servicemembers stationed in Fort Carson, Colorado as a natural experiment to estimate the effect of local veteran presence on arrests. They find that the return of a previously deployed unit had no impact on county-level arrests among 18-to-29 year-olds. However, they also document that the presence of a trained but never-deployed unit is associated with a 5.4 percent increase in the probability of a violent crime arrest in El Paso county, where Fort Carson is located. The authors attribute this result to the possibility that combat exposure may have increased soldiers’ compassion, self-discipline, resilience, and spirituality, which could

---

19 Note that these authors employ a different comparison group than the one generated from the draft lottery, relying on exogeneity of the timing of unit deployment assignments, following Lyle (2006). Unlike conscripted military service, this approach will capture the effects of deployments rather than the effect of military service per se.
deter violent crime.\textsuperscript{20} However, because the authors use aggregate county-level crime data, they cannot detect whether crime averted (or caused) is committed by veterans. Furthermore, the time horizon of their work is limited to the immediate effects of combat deployments upon returning to the United States.

The current study extends the prior literature in general, and Anderson and Rees (2015) in particular, in several important ways. First, we are able to measure crime-related behaviors that do not necessarily result in civilian arrest, including (i) court-martials or Article 15 non-judicial punishments handled exclusively through the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), (ii) criminal behavior committed outside of the unit’s stationed location, including during overseas deployments, and (iii) criminal behavior that does not result in arrest. These crime measures have the potential to capture costly criminal behaviors that are undetectable in other data, such as those examined by Anderson and Rees (2015). Second, we have individual-level data on potentially important mechanisms through which post-9/11 combat deployments may affect criminal behavior, including TBI, PTSD, illicit substance use, and exposure to intense battlefield trauma. These data will allow us, for the first time, to descriptively examine the relative importance of several key channels. Third, our analyses rely on (i) a longitudinal dataset that allows us to control for the pre-enlistment propensity for criminal behavior, and (ii) a large military dataset designed to be representative of all active-duty U.S. servicemembers around the globe. This latter source will permit more generalizable estimates of the effect of post-9/11 combat service. Finally, our data will allow us to examine both short- and longer-run impacts of military deployments, which may be important if there are a considerable lag between separation from the military and engagement with the criminal justice system (Wolfe 2013).

3. Identification Strategy

The identification strategy we rely on employs a different comparison group than the one generated from studies of the draft lottery, and the results apply to a different population. Rather than identifying the causal effect of military service per se, we identify the impact of conditionally randomly assigning an active-duty serviceman to a combat deployment. The policy parameter we obtain is essential in assessing the social costs of waging war with AVFs and is

\textsuperscript{20} Anderson and Rees (2015) conclude that soldiers deployed to war may reduce their taste for violence or even serve as role models in the community, instilling discipline, and discouraging aggressive behavior.
arguably more policy-relevant given that there is little prospect for the reinstitution of the military draft in the U.S. (Roper Center 2017).21

Our natural experiment relies on the administrative procedures by which senior commanders in the U.S. Armed Forces assign active duty deployed servicemembers to combat deployments. Individual servicemembers rarely receive deployment orders from Human Resources Command that are independent of orders given to other servicemembers.22 Rather, units (i.e., battalions) receive deployment orders. In the assigning of individual servicemembers to units and in making unit deployment assignments and then issuing deployment duties, Armed Forces Human Resource Command treats active-duty servicemen of identical rank and military occupation as perfect substitutes. As a rule, deployment assignments are made without regard to other background characteristics of servicemen, including predisposition for crime, personality, family background, home circumstances, and marital status (Engel et al. 2010).23

Unit deployment decisions are based on (i) the operational needs of the Armed Forces determined by world events, and (ii) the readiness and availability of units, measured by the occupational skill set of unit servicemembers and the timeliness of equipment for shipment (Army Regulation 220-1). Such factors are exogenous to individual servicemembers’ propensity for crime. There is no evidence that senior commanders issue unit-level deployment orders based on non-military characteristics of units (Carter and Skimmyhorn 2019; Sabia and Skimmyhorn 2019).

There are two main threats to this identification strategy. First, some individuals may be selected as “stay-back” personnel to remain on base for administrative duties. We argue that this is not a significant threat to identification because stay-back personnel represent just five percent of all active-duty servicemembers (Sabia and Skimmyhorn 2019). Studies using administrative data that have instrumented for individual deployment using unit-level deployment orders to address stay-back selection have found no evidence that the estimated effects of individual combat deployment on labor market outcomes (Sabia and Skimmyhorn 2019), program receipt (Sabia and Skimmyhorn 2019), or child well-being (Lyle 2006) are biased.

21 See: https://ropercenter.cornell.edu/blog/suppose-they-gave-war-and-nobody-came-changing-opinions-draft
22 The identification strategy we propose is similar to that used by a number of previous studies (e.g., Cesur et al. 2013; Cesur and Sabia 2016; and Lyle 2006).
23 Thus, while servicemen can affect their likelihood of seeing combat through occupation choice and re-enlistment decisions (reflected in rank), servicemen of identical rank and occupation will face equal probabilities of combat deployments at any point in time.
Second, some active-duty servicemen may be deemed "non-deployable" for reasons related to physical and mental health (National Guard Association of the United States 2018). Estimates suggest that between five and 15 percent of active-duty servicemembers have been classified as non-deployable (Arnold et al. 2011; Lacdan 2018). Given that the health effects of post-9/11 combat may be an important channel through which combat service affects crime, we address this concern in two ways. We restrict our sample to servicemen who have been deployed overseas and exploit conditionally random variation in the location of that overseas deployment assignment (e.g., to a combat or non-combat zone). And in a series of robustness checks, we condition on combat deployment length and explore the impact of exposure to enemy firefight within a combat zone. While this approach may understate the full effect of combat assignment, this “treatment effect” is unlikely to be contaminated by non-deployability.

4. Data and Measures

Our analysis makes use of two data sources: the military module of the 2007-2008 National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health), and the 2008 Department of Defense Survey of Health and Related Behaviors among Active Duty Personnel (HRBADP). While each dataset has its strengths and drawbacks, which are discussed below, the shortcomings of one survey are often rectified in the other.

The Add Health data set is a nationally representative school-based panel survey that, when weighted, is designed to be representative of all public and private U.S. middle and high school students during the 1994-95 school year. The first wave of data collection (Wave I) occurred during the 1994-95 academic year when respondents were largely ages 12 to 18. The first follow-up survey (Wave II) occurred one year later in 1996, the second follow-up survey (Wave III) in 2001-2002 when respondents were ages 18 to 26, and the third follow-up survey (Wave IV) in 2007-2008 when respondents were ages 24 to 34.

---

24 To the extent that the factors associated with being “non-deployable” are positively correlated with crime, our estimates would be a lower bound.

25 An additional concern with the above-described identification strategy is the possible sample selection bias. This could occur if combat assignments affect the likelihood of re-enlistment (and hence future combat exposure), which could impact the sample on which we can measure our outcomes under study (Sabia and Skimmyhorn 2019). While all of our regressions control for rank and enlistment length, one of our datasets, the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, allows us to measure criminal outcomes both for those who remain on active duty and those who have separated back to civilian life.

26 Wave V of the Add Health data was collected in 2016-17 and is due to be released in 2020.
Our Add Health-based analysis focuses on the military module of Wave IV. We identify 482 men who (i) reported active duty service in the U.S. Armed Forces (Army, Marines, Navy, or Air Force) after age 17, (ii) reported an overseas deployment, and (iii) provided non-missing information on criminal behavior. Of these 482 men, 286 had separated from the military by the time of the Wave IV survey, while 196 remained on active duty.

We generate our measures of combat assignments using self-reports of overseas deployments. The variable *Combat Deployment* is set equal to 1 if the active-duty deployed serviceman reports having been sent to a combat zone and set equal to 0 if overseas deployments were exclusive to non-combat zones. The definition of a combat zone is made by senior commanders. Over the sample period during which we measure deployments, combat deployments are almost exclusively in the post-9/11 period and reflect deployments to Iraq and Afghanistan as part of Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom. Because servicemen receive hostile fire or imminent danger pay when deployed to combat zones, there is strong reason to expect that survey responses will be accurate. In our analysis sample, 75.5 percent of active duty deployed servicemen received a combat zone deployment assignment while 24.5 percent were exclusively deployed overseas to non-combat zones.

In addition to deployment assignments, the Add Health includes information on whether an overseas deployed serviceman was exposed to combat. Specifically, respondents are asked:

> “Thinking about all of your deployments, [have you] or members of [your] unit, received incoming fire from small arms, artillery, rockets, or mortars…or [has your] unit fired on the enemy?”

If the active-duty serviceman reported engaging the enemy in a firefight, *Combat Exposure* is set equal to 1; it is set equal to 0 otherwise. We find that 36.7 percent of servicemen were exposed to combat during their overseas deployment assignments.

We measure criminal behavior on the extensive margin using self-reported information from the Add Health. While these measures may understate the true prevalence of crime due to its illicit nature, self-reported measures will also capture criminal behavior that remains

---

27 During this period, combat zone deployments could also include assignments in Qatar, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Sudan, Tunisia, Egypt, Syria, and Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.
undetected, did not result in arrest, and would not be captured in administrative data.\(^{28}\) Moreover, as long as measurement error in crime is unrelated to deployment assignment, marginal effects in terms of percent changes in crime should be unbiased.

At Wave IV, respondents are asked whether, in the last year, they had “deliberately damaged property that didn’t belong to you” or “stole something.” Property Crime is set equal to 1 if respondents reported stealing or damaging property, and it is set equal to 0 otherwise. We find that 9.8 percent of deployed active duty servicemen report committing a property crime.\(^{29}\)

Second, Violent Crime is set equal to 1 if, in the last 12 months, respondents had “used or threatened to use a weapon to get something from someone,” had “pulled a knife or gun on someone,” had “shot or stabbed someone,” “took part in a physical fight where a group of your friends was against another group,” or “hurt someone badly enough in a physical fight that he or she needed care from a doctor or nurse.” Otherwise, Violent Crime is set equal to 0. We find that 24.2 percent of the sample reported engaging in violent criminal activity.\(^{30}\)

Next, White Collar Crime is set equal to 1 if the respondent had, in the last year, “used someone else’s credit card, bank card, or ATM card without his/her permission or knowledge,” “deliberately write a bad check,” or “buy, sell, or hold stolen property.” Otherwise, White Collar Crime is set equal to 0. Four percent of overseas deployed servicemembers reported commission of white-collar crime.\(^{31}\)

\(^{28}\) Survey administrators took several steps to maintain data security and to minimize the potential for interviewer influence. First, respondents were not provided with any printed questionnaires. Instead, all data were recorded on laptop computers. Second, the respondents listened to pre-recorded questions through earphones for sensitive topics such as criminal behavior and entered their answers directly on the laptops. The rates of crime reported in the Add Health have been shown to be consistent with those of other sources (see Anderson et al. 2015; Mocan and Tekin 2010; Currie and Tekin 2012).\(^{29}\)

\(^{29}\) Respondents to the Add Health were asked:

“In the past 12 months, how often did you deliberately damage property that didn’t belong to you?”
“In the past 12 months, how often did you steal something (worth more/less than $50)?”

\(^{30}\) Respondents to the Add Health were asked:

“In the past 12 months, how often did you use/threaten to use a weapon to get something from someone?”
“Which of the following things happened in the past 12 months: You pulled a knife or gun on someone? (Yes/No); You shot or stabbed someone? (Yes/No)”
“In the past 12 months, how often did you take part in a physical fight where a group of your friends was against another group?”
“In the past 12 months, how often did you hurt someone badly enough in a physical fight that he or she needed care from a doctor or nurse?”

\(^{31}\) Respondents to the Add Health were asked:

“In the past 12 months, how often did you use someone else’s credit card, bank card, or automatic teller card without their permission or knowledge?”
“In the past 12 months, how often did you deliberately write a bad check?”
“In the past 12 months, how often did you buy, sell, or hold stolen property?”
We measure illicit drug sale in an analogous way, with an indicator, Drug Sale, set equal to 1 if the respondent “sold marijuana or other drugs” in the last year. We observe that 3.5 percent of the deployed sample reported selling drugs in the last year.

Finally, using self-reports of arrest histories, we generate an indicator for whether a respondent was arrested in the last year (Arrested). We find that 3.8 percent of deployed servicemen reported a criminal arrest in the last year.

In Table 1, we present the means of our five crime outcomes by deployment assignment and combat exposure. As shown in the table, the prevalence of crime is higher for those assigned to combat zones relative to non-combat zones (column 2 vs. column 3) and higher still for those assigned to combat zones where enemy firefight materializes (column 4). This pattern appears to hold across property, violent, white-collar, and drug crimes. The only exception to this pattern is the rate of arrest, which seems to be lower among those assigned to combat zones relative to non-combat zones.

An important advantage of the Add Health is that the survey includes information on all key military observables available to Human Resources Command when the conditional random assignment of servicemen to overseas deployments are made. These include the branch of service (Amy, Marines, Navy, and Air Force), highest rank attained, duration of service, occupation, and whether still on active duty at the time of the Wave IV survey. The availability of these variables ensures that the observed variation in overseas deployment assignment will be orthogonal to criminal behavior.

The Add Health is also rich in pre-deployment measures of personal and family background characteristics including age, race/ethnicity, height, weight, number of siblings, parental educational attainment, parental marital status, Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) score, and religiosity (each measured at Wave I). Importantly, we can also measure criminal behaviors prior to enlistment into the U.S. Armed Forces. Given the procedures through

\[^32\] Appendix Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics for control variables in the Add Health.  
\[^33\] For enlisted servicemen, ranks in the sample vary from Army Private to Chief Warrant Officer in the Army, Seaman Recruit to Chief Petty Officer in the Navy, Airman to Master Sergeant in the Air Force, and Marine Lance Corporal to Staff Sergeant in the Marines. For officers, ranks vary from Captain to Chief Warrant Officer in the Army, Lieutenant Junior Grade to Lieutenant Commander in the Navy, Lieutenant to Chief Warrant Officer in the Air Force, and Second Lieutenant to Captain in the Marines.
which military deployment assignments are made, deployment assignments should be unrelated to these observables, conditional on within-branch rank, occupation, and timing of service.

One of the limitations of the Add Health is that the size for the military sample is relatively small. This means that the research design has relatively low statistical power, a problem that is exacerbated when attempting to examine heterogeneous effects of combat across service branches and servicemember characteristics. Moreover, estimated combat effects using the Add Health data may not generalize to all active duty overseas deployed servicemen.

To supplement our Add Health analysis, we turn to the 2008 HRBADP Survey. The HRBADP Survey, a representative survey of the active-duty members of the armed forces, includes 28,546 men and women between ages 18 to 50. Although a large majority of interviews were conducted at facilities under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Military, such as military bases, camps, posts, stations, yards, and centers, a small fraction of surveys were completed via mail for those who could not be present in on-site surveys. Participating individuals completed these self-administered surveys via the use of pencil and paper. As the participants did not answer the questions using a computer-assisted self-interview (CASI) survey instrument, estimates on sensitive information may suffer from underreporting bias. Nevertheless, if combat assignment is orthogonal to the likelihood of criminal involvement, such measurement error should not affect our results. When weighted, the HRBADP survey sample is designed to be representative of all U.S. active-duty personnel serving around the globe.

Our main analysis sample is comprised of 11,542 active duty servicemen who (i) reported an overseas deployment assignment, (ii) provided non-missing information on whether they were exposed to combat, and (iii) provided non-missing information on crime-related behavior. In contrast to the Add Health, the HRBADP survey measures criminal behavior that has exclusively occurred while the servicemember was on active duty. Hence, we measure the short-run effects of combat assignment on criminal behavior that could be (or is) punished according to military rather than civilian law.

Our primary measure of combat in the HRBADP survey is Combat Exposure, which captures a similar measure as that reported in the Add Health. Respondents are asked:

---

34 The data collection effort was conducted by the Research Triangle Institute. Bray et al. (2009) provide detailed information on the HRBADP data collection procedures.
“Thinking about all of your deployments, [have you] or members of [your] unit, received incoming fire from small arms, artillery, rockets, or mortars...or [has your] unit fired on the enemy?”

Combat Exposure is set equal to 1 for servicemen who reported engaging the enemy in a firefight, and it is set equal to 0 otherwise. We find that 51.5 percent of the HRBADP sample reported exposure to combat, much of it in Afghanistan and Iraq, including the so-called surge in 2007-2008. One limitation of the HRBADP deployment data is that we cannot disentangle overseas deployments to non-combat zones and deployments to combat zones without enemy engagement beyond the year before the administration of the survey. Thus, if there are crime effects of combat from combat zone deployments without combat exposure – perhaps because of the psychological consequences of fearing war could materialize – estimates from the HRBADP Survey will understate the full crime effect of combat assignment.

We measure five crime-related outcomes in the HRBADP survey. First, respondents are instructed to indicate whether (and how many times) in the last year, the following events happened to them:

“I received a UCMJ punishment (e.g. Court Martial, Article 15, Captain’s Mast, Office Hours, Letter of Reprimand, Other).”
“I had trouble with the police (civilian or military).”
“I was arrested."
“I got into a fight where I hit someone other than a member of my family.”

From these items, four dichotomous variables are generated. UCMJ Punishment, Trouble with Police, Arrested, and Physical Fight are each set equal to 1 if the respondent indicated that the event had happened to him at least once in the last year. These variables are set to 0 otherwise. In our analysis sample, 6.9 percent of individuals reported receiving a UCMJ punishment, 6.7 percent reported trouble with police, 0.5 percent reported to being arrested, and 6.7 percent reported hitting others in physical fights. Finally, respondents are asked whether they were currently gang members (Gang Member). We find that 1.3 percent of our analysis sample reported being in a gang.

Table 2 presents means of the key variables from the HRBADP Survey for the pooled sample (column 1), those deployed to combat zones with enemy firefight (column 2), and those
deployed to non-combat zones or combat zones without enemy firefight (column 3). Consistent with findings from the Add Health in Table 1, results from the DOD survey show higher crime prevalence and gang membership rates for those exposed to combat during combat deployments as compared to those deployed overseas who do not face enemy engagement. For example, UCMJ punishments were 36.2 percent more likely for active duty servicemen exposed to combat relative to those who were deployed but not exposed to combat.

An important advantage of the HRBADP Survey is the large sample that, when weighted, is designed to be representative of all active duty deployed servicemembers. With a sample size over 25 times greater than that of the Add Health military module, the HRBADP Survey data allow for higher statistical power as well as an exploration of heterogeneous combat effects by the branch of service and servicemember background. Moreover, the estimates have a greater degree of external validity. However, limitations of these data include (i) an inability to examine longer-run post-separation criminal behavior, (ii) lack of data on military occupation, which poses a (surmountable) challenge to identification, and (iii) an inability to disentangle overseas deployments to non-combat zones from deployments to combat zones without enemy firefight beyond the year prior to the 2007-2008 data collection effort. Many of these limitations are mitigated by the use of the complementary Add Health data.

5. Empirical Approach

We begin with a set of descriptive tests of the exogeneity of combat deployments. We use ordinary least squares regression (OLS) to examine whether personal and family background characteristics are related to the probability of a combat deployment, after controlling for military characteristics of servicemen available to Human Resources Command:

\[
\text{Combat Deployment}_i = \delta_0 + \mathbf{M}_i \delta_1 + \mathbf{X}_i \delta_2 + \delta_3 \text{PreCrime}_i + \nu_i
\]

\[
\text{Combat Exposure}_i = \alpha_0 + \mathbf{M}_i \alpha_1 + \mathbf{X}_i \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 \text{PreCrime}_i + \mu_i
\]

where \( \mathbf{M}_i \) is a vector of military observables available to Human Resources Command including indicators for the branch of service, military rank, occupation, year of enlistment, whether on active duty at the time of the Wave IV survey, and the timing of the interview; \( \mathbf{X}_i \) is a vector of

\[35\] Appendix Table 2 displays the summary statistics for control variables in the HRBADP.
personal and family background controls for individual $i$ measured prior to enlistment, including age, gender, height, number of siblings, parental educational attainment, parental marital status, Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) score, race/ethnicity, religion, height, and weight; and $PreCrime$ is a vector of servicemembers’ criminal behaviors measured prior to enlistment into the U.S. Armed Forces. If combat assignment is conditionally random, then $\delta_2 = \delta_3 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = 0$.

Next, we estimate the impact of combat assignment on crime in the Add Health:

$$Crime_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Combat Deployment_i + M_i \beta_2 + X_i \beta_3 + \beta_4 PreCrime_i + \epsilon_i$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

If combat assignment is exogenous to crime, then $\beta_1$ can be interpreted as the causal impact of assignment to a combat zone (relative to assignment to a non-combat zone overseas deployment) on the probability of subsequent crime commission.

We then add an indicator for whether the respondent was exposed to combat during his combat deployment assignment:

$$Crime_i = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 Combat Deployment without Exposure_i + \gamma_2 Combat Exposure_i + M_i \gamma_3 + X_i \gamma_4 + \gamma_5 PreCrime_i + \sigma_i$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

In the above specification, $\gamma_1$ can be interpreted as the crime effect of deployment to a combat zone without enemy firefight, and $\gamma_2$ can be interpreted as the crime effect of deployment to a combat zone with enemy engagement.

Turning to the HRBADP Survey, after conducting a similar set of descriptive tests for the exogeneity of deployment assignment, we estimate:

$$Crime_i = \lambda_0 + \lambda_1 Combat Exposure_i + H_i \lambda_2 + Z_i \lambda_3 + \omega_i$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

where $H_i$ is a vector of military observables available in the HRBADP Survey, including the branch of service, branch-specific rank-by-major command, and $Z_i$ is a vector of individual-level observables including race/ethnicity, age, and educational attainment. Our key coefficient of interest, $\lambda_1$, should produce unbiased estimates of the effect of combat exposure on criminal

---

36 Since the sampling design of Add Health is school-based, the standard errors are corrected for clustering at the school level.
activity to the extent that this specification captures the conditional random assignment of
servicemembers to combat zones.\textsuperscript{37}

6. Results

6.1 Exogeneity of Combat Deployments

We begin by presenting results from balancing tests performed on the Add Health sample in Table 3A. These tests are designed to capture whether our assumption of conditional random assignment of deployment is valid. All models include the vector of military observables (the branch of service, rank, occupation, timing, and length of enlisted service), and then adds sequential sets of background characteristics from the vectors $X_i$ and $\text{PreCrime}_i$. Note that the coefficients and standard errors, shown in Table 3, are generated from regressions that include controls for $M_i$ and the addition of pre-enlistment non-military characteristics one at a time (and then finally all together). Thus, they are tests of conditional mean differences in personal and family background characteristics, conditional on all of the military observables (branch of service, military rank, occupation, and length/timing of enlistment) that Human Resources Command uses to make deployment assignments.

Our results in column (1) of Table 3A show that background characteristics in $X_i$ have no individual predictive power in explaining deployment to a combat zone. Moreover, criminal behavior measured prior to enlistment (at Wave I of the Add Health survey) does not predict being assigned to a combat zone (joint F-stat = 0.78 and p-value = 0.54). Finally, when all variables in the vector $X_i$ and $\text{PreCrime}_i$ are simultaneously included as controls, a test of the joint significance of all of these observables generates an F-statistic of 1.01 and a p-value of 0.46. This pattern of findings is consistent with the administrative procedures through which active-duty servicemen are assigned to their deployment duties.

We then repeat the above analysis by exploring whether those assigned to combat zones where enemy firefight materializes are systematically different from those deployed to combat

\textsuperscript{37} Prior work by Cesur et al. (2019) and Cesur and Sabia (2016) finds that Major Command-by-rank-by-education controls adequately proxy for occupation. We take two approaches to push this assumption further. First, in Appendix Table 3, we show that when we restrict the Add Health observables to those available in the HRBADP Survey and re-estimate equations (3) and (4), estimates of $\beta_1$, $\gamma_1$, and $\gamma_2$ are largely unchanged. Second, we use a nearest neighbor matching approach to match combat deployed, and non-combat deployed servicemen using each of the right-hand-side variables in equation (5). As discussed below, the nearest neighbor matching estimates of the effect of combat deployments on crime are quantitatively similar to those produced by equation (5).
zones without enemy firefight (column 2) or to non-combat zones (column 3). The pattern of results is remarkably similar. The only exception is for Hispanics, who are less likely to be assigned to combat zones with enemy firefight. In supplemental analyses, we restrict our sample to non-Hispanic whites and find a pattern of results similar to those reported on the full sample.

In Table 3B, we show descriptive evidence for conditional random assignment in the HRBADP Survey. Because we lack data on occupation, we are careful to match “treatment” (assigned to combat zones where enemy firefight occurred) and “control” (assigned to non-combat zones or combat zones without enemy firefight) servicemen on available military characteristics. Consistent with our Add Health-based results, the results in Table 3B show little evidence that sociodemographic controls in the HRBADP Survey predict combat exposure. Together, findings in Tables 3A and 3B are consistent with the hypothesis that deployment orders are issued exogenously to future crime commission.

6.2 Add Health Results

Table 4 presents estimates of the effect of combat zone deployment on crime using the Add Health data.\textsuperscript{38}\footnote{Standard errors are corrected for clustering on the school, which is the unit of sampling in the Add Health. However, if we cluster standard errors at the occupation-by-rank level, the results are qualitatively similar.} Controlling for the vector $\mathbf{M}$, alone (Panel I), we find that assignment to a combat zone is associated with a 0.092 increase in the probability of committing a property crime (column 1), and a 0.037 increase in the probability of committing a white-collar crime (column 3). While the estimated effects on violent crime (column 2) and drug crime (column 4) are also positive and economically meaningful, 0.064 and 0.023 respectively, these estimates are not statistically distinguishable from zero at conventional levels. Interestingly, the estimated effect of combat zone deployment on the probability of arrest is zero (column 5). This could suggest that criminal activities in which servicemembers are engaged are infrequently detected or punished. If that is the case, focusing on arrest probabilities alone may understate the crime-related social costs of war. However, our measure of arrests captures only those taken into custody in the last year and released before the administration of the Add Health survey. Thus, this measure likely only captures minor crimes that are committed recently.

In Panel II of Table 4, we explore heterogeneity in the crime effects of combat service by whether the combat zone deployment involved exposure to enemy firefight. Our findings suggest
that the effects of combat deployments on property crime (column 1) and white-collar crime (column 3) do not differ by whether combat exposure materializes. However, our point estimates suggest that exposure to enemy firefight has a larger positive effect (0.118 vs 0.018) on the probability that a serviceman subsequently commits a violent crime (column 2). A similar pattern of result appears for drug crimes (column 4), though this effect is imprecisely estimated.

In the final two panels of Table 4, we add controls for individual and family background characteristics (Panel III) and pre-enlistment crime (Panel IV) respectively. We highlight two important findings in these panels. First, the magnitudes of the estimated effects of combat assignment on crime are quite similar to those shown in Panel II, consistent with the hypothesis that combat deployments are assigned exogenously to a wide set of pre-enlistment non-military observables, further adding to our confidence in our identification strategy. Second, the findings in Panel IV now show that combat exposure is associated with significantly larger increases in the probabilities of both violent and drug crime, in part because the estimates are more precisely estimated. In summary, the findings in Table 4 suggest that physical or psychological shocks from firefight exposure may be more important mechanisms to explain increases in violent offenses as compared to property crime.

In Table 5, we explore whether the effects of combat zone deployment on crime differ for those who have separated from the military as compared to those who remain on active duty. While the sample sizes are relatively small, and therefore, the estimates are imprecise, we find the strongest evidence for property crime effects among those whose active duty service has concluded rather than for those who remain on active duty. To the extent that those who remain on active duty are more stable financially and have easier access to credit, healthcare, and housing, such individuals may have less of an incentive to engage in economically motivated illegal activities. In contrast, combat-induced increases in violent crime are present both for those who have separated from the military and those for whom service is ongoing at the time of the Wave IV survey.
6.3 HRBADP Survey Main Findings

Table 6 presents our main findings from the HRBADP Survey. In Panel I, we control for military observables available in the HRBADP survey. We find that assignment to a combat zone with enemy firefight induces a 0.025 increase in the probability of receiving a punishment under the UCMJ (column 1), a 0.022 increase in the probability of trouble with military or civilian police (column 2), a 0.005 increase in the probability of arrest (column 3), a 0.035 increase in violent physical fighting with strangers (column 4), and a 0.017 increase in the probability of gang membership (column 5). These results provide further evidence that post-9/11 combat deployments increased criminal activity among recent combat veterans and suggest that many of these crime costs materialize prior to separation from the U.S. Armed Forces.

While the results presented in the top panel are qualitatively similar to those shown in Table 4, they are quantitatively smaller. This is consistent with the above argument that the effect of deployment on crime is likely to be understated in the analysis with the HRBADP data as compared to the Add Health data to the extent that those assigned to combat zones without enemy firefight also experience increases in the propensity for crime.

In Panel II of Table 6, we add controls for non-military characteristics to the regression. Reassuringly, the estimated crime effects are nearly identical, consistent with the conditional random assignment of overseas deployments. Along the same lines, in Panel III, we use a nearest neighbor matching procedure to ensure that those deployed to combat zones with enemy firefight and those deployed without seeing enemy firefight were well matched on observables available to Human Resources Command (branch of service, rank, occupation, Major Command, and education). The results from the matching estimator are quantitatively similar to those obtained in Panels I and II.

---

39 Estimated effects of combat service on crime obtained from the HRBADP survey data may differ from those obtained from the Add Health data for several reasons. First, the sample is more representative of all active-duty servicemen than the non-representative Add Health sample. Second, combat zone deployments without enemy firefight cannot be disentangled from non-combat zone deployments in the HRBADP data, a limitation that may underscore the crime effects of combat deployments. Finally, estimated crime effects we uncover in the HRBADP data are driven by criminal activity prior to separation from the U.S. Armed Forces. For these reasons, we view the results obtained from the analysis with HRBADP data as a complement to the analysis with Add Health data rather than a substitute. Standard errors in all of our HRBADP Survey results are corrected for clustering on the stratum, which is the unit of sampling. If we instead cluster standard errors at the Major Command-by-rank level, the results are nearly identical.

40 We employ a nearest neighbor matching procedure without replacement using a caliper value of 0.00001. Employing alternative caliper values, such as 0.001, 0.0001, and 0.0005, produce results very similar to those presented here. We also estimated out models using alternative matching procedures, including nearest neighbor
An examination of heterogeneity in the crime effects of combat exposure by the branch of service suggests larger crime effects for those serving in the Army (Panel IV), Marines (Panel V), and Navy (Panel VI) relative to the Air Force (Panel VII), with the exception of arrests. These results are consistent with much of the prior military literature, which finds that the adverse health (Cesur et al. 2013), human capital (Sabia and Skimmyhorn 2019; Cesur et al. 2016), and family violence (Cesur and Sabia 2016) effects of post-9/11 deployments are smaller for airmen relative to those serving in other branches.

In Table 7, we find that the crime effects of post-9/11 combat exposure are more substantial for servicemen younger than age 33 as compared to those ages 33 and older (Panel I). Interestingly, we also find evidence that post-9/11 combat assignments increase criminal behavior among women (Panel II) and do not appear to largely differ by race or ethnicity, except white-collar crime (Panel III). Finally, each of the crime effects we uncover is uniformly larger among enlisted servicemen as compared to officers (Panel IV), consistent with evidence that the largest adverse health effects of combat service are found for enlisted servicemen (Cesur et al. 2019). This pattern is also consistent with the notion that the opportunity cost of engaging in crime is likely to be higher among officers.

6.4 Length of Deployments and Intensity of Combat Exposure

While combat exposure is more likely with longer and more frequent deployments, it may be important to disentangle these effects to judge how important psychological trauma and physical injury of enemy engagement are in explaining the crime effects we observe. We do this in Table 8. Across crime outcomes, we find evidence that the length and frequency of combat deployments are positively related to the probability of crime (columns 2 and 3). However, including combat exposure, the number of post-9/11 combat deployments, and average length of combat deployment all in the same model (column 4) results in only one variable, combat exposure, being economically consequential and statistically distinguishable from zero in most matching with replacement, k-nearest neighbor, and exact matching on the branch of service. Our results are robust to employing these matching methods.

41 However, given that the mean for arrests is less than one half of one percent, we test the robustness of this finding to the use of a probit model rather than OLS. These findings in Appendix Table 4 show little evidence that combat exposure affected the probability of arrest for those in the air force. The remainder of findings are comparable to our OLS results.

42 There is also strong evidence that length and number of deployments (as well as the location of deployment) is also conditionally randomly assigned (Anderson and Rees 2015; Lyle 2006).
cases. This suggests that combat exposure is likely the primary trigger for the rise in criminal propensities among active-duty servicemen.

To examine whether the intensity of combat exacerbates the effects of combat exposure, Panel I of Table 9 presents estimates of the effect of a combat intensity index on crime. This index, provided by the HRBADP survey, is constructed based on 17 questions pertaining to combat experiences, including whether the veteran has engaged in hand-to-hand combat, fired on the enemy, knew someone who died in combat, and interacted with prisoners of war. The index ranges from 0 to 68 with higher levels indicating more intense combat. We use the constructed combat intensity index by the HRBADP, which defined High Intensity Combat as having 10 or more positive indicators of combat and Lower Intensity Combat as 1 to 9 (Bray et al. 2009).

The estimates, displayed in Panel I of Table 9, show that high intensity combat exposure has a far larger effect on the probability of crime commission than lower intensity combat exposure. For example, high intensity exposure is associated with a 0.038 increase in the probability of UCMJ punishment (column 1), a 0.008 increase in the probability of arrest (column 3), and a 0.029 increase in the probability of being a gang member (column 5).

In Panel II of Table 9, we explore the impact of specific forms of battlefield trauma on crime. Specifically, we examine whether the veteran (i) suffered an injury during his deployment to a combat zone; (ii) witnessed the injury or death of an allied soldier; and (iii) witnessed the

---

43 The combat exposure index is constructed by the HRBADP survey based on answers to the following 17 questions, with possible frequencies: 0; 1 to 3; 4 to 12; 13 to 50; and 51 or more.

*Thinking about all of your deployments, how many times have you had each of the following experiences?*
- I was sent outside the wire on combat patrols, convoys, or sorties.
- I, or members of my unit, received incoming fire from small arms, artillery, rockets, or mortars.
- I, or members of my unit, encountered mines, booby traps, or IEDs (improvised explosive devices).
- I worked with landmines or other unexploded ordnances.
- My unit fired on the enemy.
- I personally fired my weapon at the enemy.
- I engaged in hand-to-hand combat.
- I was responsible for the death or serious injury of an enemy.
- I witnessed members of my unit or an ally unit being seriously wounded or killed.
- My unit suffered casualties.
- I saw dead bodies or human remains.
- I handled, uncovered, or removed dead bodies or human remains.
- Someone I knew well was killed in combat.
- I took care of injured or dying people.
- I interacted with enemy prisoners of war.
- I witnessed or engaged in acts of cruelty, excessive force, or acts violating rules of engagement.
- I was wounded in combat.
death of an enemy soldier. We find that the relationship between combat deployment and subsequent crime is the strongest among those who suffered an injury. This finding lends further support to the notion that physiological or physical trauma suffered during combat missions may be key to subsequent criminal behavior.44

6.5 Mechanisms

The above results, across two datasets, show that post-9/11 combat deployments substantially increased the probability of veteran crime commission. We now descriptively explore observable mechanisms through which combat exposure might affect crime. Specifically, we examine the roles of TBI, PTSD, binge drinking, and substance abuse as potential channels.45 First, consistent with the prior literature, we document in Appendix Table 5 that combat assignment to zones with enemy firefight substantially increases the risk of exhibiting the symptoms of TBI, PTSD, and substance abuse.

44However, we note that 70 percent of those who witnessed an enemy death also witnessed an ally hurt, and 50 percent of those who observed the death or injury of an ally also observed an enemy death.
45 We define TBI as an indicator using HRBADP Survey criteria in which an individual is identified as exposed to TBI based on responses to a list of items about events experienced during deployments, including "[experiencing] blast or explosion (IED, RPG, land mine, grenade, etc.)" "vehicular accident/crash (any vehicle, including aircraft)," "fragment wound above the shoulders," "bullet wound above the shoulder," "fall," "lost consciousness or got 'knocked out,'" "felt dazed, confused, or 'saw stars,'" "didn't remember the event," "had a concussion or symptoms of a concussion (such as headache, dizziness, irritability, etc.)," or "had a head injury."

We define PTSD as an indicator using HRBADP Survey criteria in which an individual is identified as exhibiting the symptoms of PTSD based on responses to a list of items about things bothering the respondent in the last month, including "Repeated, disturbing memories, thoughts or images of a stressful experience," "Repeated, disturbing dreams of a stressful experience," "Suddenly acting or feeling as if a stressful experience were happening again (as if you were reliving it)," "Feeling very upset when something reminded you of a stressful experience," "Having physical reactions (e.g., heart pounding, trouble breathing, sweating) when something reminded you of a stressful experience," "Avoiding thinking about or talking about a stressful experience or avoiding having feelings related to it," "Avoiding activities or situations because they reminded you of a stressful experience," "Trouble remembering important parts of a stressful experience," "Loss of interest in activities you used to enjoy," "Feeling distant or cut off from other people," "Feeling emotionally numb or being unable to have loving feelings for those close to you," "Feeling as if your future somehow will be cut short," "Trouble falling or staying asleep," "Feeling irritable or having angry outbursts," "Having difficulty concentrating," "Being 'superalert' or watchful or on guard," or "Feeling jumpy or easily startled."

Binge Drinking is a dummy variable set equal to 1 if the respondent reports consuming at least 5 drinks in a single occasion in the past 30 days.

Substance Abuse is a dummy variable set equal to 1 if the respondent reported consuming marijuana, cocaine, PCP, MDMA, hallucinogens, methamphetamine, heroin, GHB, inhalants, or painkillers (for non-medical reasons) in the last 12 months.
In Table 10, we descriptively explore their mediating role of various factors. In Panel I, we reproduce our baseline estimates of the effect of combat exposure on crime. Then, we add a control for TBI (Panel II), PTSD (Panel III), binge drinking (Panel IV), substance abuse (Panel V), and finally all of these endogenous mediators (Panel VI). The findings show that the estimated crime effects fall by the largest magnitudes (20 to 38 percent) with the addition of TBI in the model (Panel II versus Panel I). PTSD appears to be the second most important mediator, with estimated crime effects declining by 19 to 26 percent. Binge drinking and substance abuse appear to be relatively less important pathways to crime, suggesting that addiction may play a smaller role. Together, the inclusion of controls for all of our observed mediators (Panel VI) reduces the magnitudes of our estimated crime effects of combat by 41 to 54 percent.

7. Conclusions

U.S-led wars in Iraq and Afghanistan following the September 11, 2011 attacks on the American homeland constitute the longest wars in the nation’s history. The Global War on Terrorism (GWOT) constitutes the second most costly war in American history, topped only by World War II (Congressional Research Service 2010). Estimates from the Watson Institute (2019) place the budgetary costs of this conflict at over $5.6 trillion, which includes increased public expenditures on VDC benefits (Sabia and Skimmyhorn 2019; Stiglitz and Bilmes 2008) and Veterans Health Administration-provided health care benefits (Congressional Budget Office 2010; Stiglitz and Bilmes 2008). However, the cost of fighting the GWOT on public budgets may vastly understate the social costs of this conflict if waging Operation Enduring Freedom, Operation New Dawn, and Operation Iraqi Freedom have increased the likelihood of criminal behavior by veterans following war deployments.

This paper provides new evidence on the effect of post-9/11 combat deployments on subsequent criminal behavior among veterans. Using data from two national surveys and exploiting exogenous assignment to combat zones generated by U.S. Armed Forces administrative procedures, our analysis shows that deployment to combat zones in the post-9/11 era substantially increased criminal tendencies among servicemembers. In addition to significant increases in property and violent crime, our results indicate that combat exposure resulted in a higher likelihood of trouble with military and civilian police, arrest, and punishment under UCMJ. Our auxiliary analysis suggests that the rise in TBI and PTSD are the likely explanations
behind the rise in crime among servicemembers. Thus, the changing nature of modern warfare and war-related injuries, along with the waging of war with AVFs, may help to explain why the crime effects of post-9/11 warfare are larger than in prior conflicts.

Back-of-the-envelope calculations suggest that combat exposure generated substantial economic costs to society in the form of additional crime. Using the marginal effects we obtain from Table 4, and per-crime costs of property and violent crime reported by Chalfin (2015), we estimate post-9/11 combat exposure-induced crime costs of approximately $26.4 billion for violent crime and $315 million for property crime (in 2018 dollars). Moreover, we note that these estimates may be lower bound given that assignment to a combat zone without enemy firefight may also generate increases in property crime.

Our findings have a number of important public policy implications. The discovery of high social costs of crime from post-9/11 combat deployments significantly influences the cost-effectiveness of programs designed to ease veterans’ transition from military to civilian life, such as the Department of Labor Veterans’ Employment and Training Service (VETS) and the Morale, Welfare, and Recreation (MWR) programs. Moreover, our findings have important implications for the optimal provision of services designed to comprehensively address PTSD, TBI, and other combat-related trauma among active-duty personnel. Finally, a recent poll shows that the American public is increasingly opposed to new U.S. military interventions (Carden 2018). Revealing previously undocumented social costs of post-9/11 warfare may strengthen this sentiment and influence future decisions by the U.S. government to engage in military action.

---

46 The median cost per incident for each index crime among estimates in the extant literature reported by Chalfin (2015) is $5,600,000 for homicide, $157,500 for rape, $40,950 for robbery, $89,250 for assault, $5,431 for burglary, $2,086 for larceny, and $9,341 for motor vehicle theft in 2012 dollars. Using the median cost per incident and the total number of each index crimes committed in the United States in 2018 reported by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, we calculated the weighted average cost of each violent crime (i.e., homicide, rape, robbery, and assault) to be $176,619 and each property crime (i.e., burglary, larceny, and motor vehicle theft) to be $3,827, both in 2018 dollars. A 2018 RAND study indicates that, of the 2.77 million service members deployed to GWOT in Iraq and Afghanistan, 2.1 million were active duty members (Wenger et al. 2018). According to the HRBADP, which is designed to be representative of active duty forces, 51.5 percent of service members had been exposed to combat. Combining these figures with our estimates of the effect of combat exposure on violent crime ranging from 0.118 to 0.138 (Panels II through IV of Table 4) and 0.076 to 0.093 for property crime, we obtain cost estimates of $22.5 to $26.4 billion for violent crime and $315 to $385 million for property crime.
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### Table 1: Combat and Crime Measures, Add Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full Sample</td>
<td>Combat Zone</td>
<td>Non-Combat Zone</td>
<td>Combat Exposure</td>
<td>Combat Service without Exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat Zone Deployment</td>
<td>0.755</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.430)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat Exposure</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.486</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.483)</td>
<td>(0.501)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat Service without Exposure</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>0.514</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.488)</td>
<td>(0.501)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Combat Measures**

**Dependent Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Crime</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.298)</td>
<td>(0.317)</td>
<td>(0.221)</td>
<td>(0.319)</td>
<td>(0.317)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>0.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.429)</td>
<td>(0.438)</td>
<td>(0.398)</td>
<td>(0.458)</td>
<td>(0.415)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Collar Crime</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.195)</td>
<td>(0.200)</td>
<td>(0.182)</td>
<td>(0.183)</td>
<td>(0.215)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Crime</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.185)</td>
<td>(0.186)</td>
<td>(0.182)</td>
<td>(0.210)</td>
<td>(0.162)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.190)</td>
<td>(0.172)</td>
<td>(0.237)</td>
<td>(0.167)</td>
<td>(0.177)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard deviations in parentheses.
Table 2: Combat and Crime Measures, HRBADP Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Combat Exposure</td>
<td>Non-Combat Exposure</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Marines</td>
<td>Navy</td>
<td>Air Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat Exposure</td>
<td>0.515</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>0.706</td>
<td>0.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.500)</td>
<td>(0.396)</td>
<td>(0.456)</td>
<td>(0.414)</td>
<td>(0.497)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Intensity Combat</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>0.609</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.631</td>
<td>0.464</td>
<td>0.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.466)</td>
<td>(0.483)</td>
<td>(0.499)</td>
<td>(0.318)</td>
<td>(0.368)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Post-9/11 Deployments</td>
<td>1.884</td>
<td>2.199</td>
<td>1.550</td>
<td>1.751</td>
<td>1.692</td>
<td>1.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.674)</td>
<td>(1.562)</td>
<td>(1.725)</td>
<td>(1.452)</td>
<td>(1.302)</td>
<td>(1.748)</td>
<td>(1.979)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Deployment Length</td>
<td>2.808</td>
<td>3.561</td>
<td>2.007</td>
<td>3.623</td>
<td>3.111</td>
<td>2.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.728)</td>
<td>(4.063)</td>
<td>(3.144)</td>
<td>(4.587)</td>
<td>(3.766)</td>
<td>(3.407)</td>
<td>(3.037)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCMJ Punishment</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.253)</td>
<td>(0.270)</td>
<td>(0.234)</td>
<td>(0.275)</td>
<td>(0.262)</td>
<td>(0.227)</td>
<td>(0.255)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trouble Police</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.251)</td>
<td>(0.270)</td>
<td>(0.228)</td>
<td>(0.281)</td>
<td>(0.273)</td>
<td>(0.235)</td>
<td>(0.218)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.068)</td>
<td>(0.079)</td>
<td>(0.053)</td>
<td>(0.074)</td>
<td>(0.063)</td>
<td>(0.069)</td>
<td>(0.065)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fight</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.250)</td>
<td>(0.279)</td>
<td>(0.213)</td>
<td>(0.295)</td>
<td>(0.285)</td>
<td>(0.238)</td>
<td>(0.176)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang Member</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.111)</td>
<td>(0.138)</td>
<td>(0.072)</td>
<td>(0.141)</td>
<td>(0.123)</td>
<td>(0.106)</td>
<td>(0.070)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>11542</td>
<td>5948</td>
<td>5594</td>
<td>2563</td>
<td>2507</td>
<td>3374</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard deviations in parentheses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Combat Deployment vs Non-Combat Deployment</th>
<th>Combat Exposure vs No Combat Exposure</th>
<th>Combat Exposure vs Non-Combat Deployment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Deployment Property Crime</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.049)</td>
<td>(0.052)</td>
<td>(0.072)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Deployment Violent Crime</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.042)</td>
<td>(0.049)</td>
<td>(0.058)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Deployment Drug Crime</td>
<td>-0.073</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
<td>-0.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.059)</td>
<td>(0.077)</td>
<td>(0.088)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-deployment Arrest</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.101)</td>
<td>(0.127)</td>
<td>(0.109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint F-test (p-value) for Pre-Deployment Crime</td>
<td>0.78 (0.54)</td>
<td>0.64 (0.63)</td>
<td>0.63 (0.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 1 Height</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 1 Weight</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 1 Protestant</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.066)</td>
<td>(0.090)</td>
<td>(0.099)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 1 Catholic</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.075)</td>
<td>(0.095)</td>
<td>(0.111)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 1 Other Religion</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.133)</td>
<td>(0.159)</td>
<td>(0.237)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-test (p-value) for Religion Indicators</td>
<td>0.65 (0.58)</td>
<td>0.02 (0.99)</td>
<td>0.08 (0.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age in Years</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.411)</td>
<td>(0.409)</td>
<td>(0.598)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age in Years Squared</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-test (p-value) for Age</td>
<td>0.29(0.75)</td>
<td>0.30 (0.74)</td>
<td>0.56 (0.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Black</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.052)</td>
<td>(0.058)</td>
<td>(0.073)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Other</td>
<td>0.140**</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.062)</td>
<td>(0.070)</td>
<td>(0.118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-test (p-value) for Race</td>
<td>2.63 (0.07)</td>
<td>0.54(0.58)</td>
<td>0.78(0.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combat Deployment vs Non-Combat Deployment (1)</td>
<td>Combat Exposure vs No Combat Exposure (2)</td>
<td>Combat Exposure vs Non-Combat Deployment (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity: Hispanic</td>
<td>-0.014 (0.048)</td>
<td>-0.161*** (0.053)</td>
<td>-0.084 (0.081)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>0.027 (0.054)</td>
<td>-0.002 (0.056)</td>
<td>0.024 (0.075)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>0.109 (0.082)</td>
<td>-0.001 (0.086)</td>
<td>0.074 (0.121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$19K=&lt;Parental Income &lt;$28K</td>
<td>-0.011 (0.086)</td>
<td>0.005 (0.095)</td>
<td>-0.036 (0.134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$28K=&lt;Parental Income &lt;$36K</td>
<td>0.054 (0.075)</td>
<td>0.066 (0.097)</td>
<td>0.045 (0.119)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$36K=&lt;Parental Income &lt;$45K</td>
<td>0.057 (0.083)</td>
<td>0.015 (0.081)</td>
<td>0.045 (0.123)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45K=&lt;Parental Income &lt;$56K</td>
<td>0.090 (0.073)</td>
<td>0.056 (0.080)</td>
<td>0.104 (0.102)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$56K=&lt;Parental Income &lt;$83K</td>
<td>0.165** (0.088)</td>
<td>0.098 (0.105)</td>
<td>0.190 (0.124)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents: Married</td>
<td>-0.093 (0.076)</td>
<td>0.045 (0.136)</td>
<td>-0.107 (0.149)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents: Divorced, Separated or Widowed</td>
<td>-0.129 (0.092)</td>
<td>0.056 (0.152)</td>
<td>-0.140 (0.170)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers Education: High School</td>
<td>0.029 (0.097)</td>
<td>0.014 (0.074)</td>
<td>0.020 (0.116)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers Education: Above High School</td>
<td>0.023 (0.091)</td>
<td>0.060 (0.074)</td>
<td>0.075 (0.122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One sibling</td>
<td>0.048 (0.095)</td>
<td>0.085 (0.137)</td>
<td>0.077 (0.141)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two siblings</td>
<td>0.029 (0.094)</td>
<td>0.094 (0.137)</td>
<td>0.037 (0.141)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combat Deployment vs Non-Combat Deployment</td>
<td>Combat Exposure vs No Combat Exposure</td>
<td>Combat Exposure vs Non-Combat Deployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three siblings</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.107)</td>
<td>(0.142)</td>
<td>(0.164)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four siblings</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.103)</td>
<td>(0.143)</td>
<td>(0.155)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five or more siblings</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.108)</td>
<td>(0.133)</td>
<td>(0.173)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-test (p-value) for Number of Siblings</td>
<td>0.189 (0.98)</td>
<td>0.109 (0.99)</td>
<td>0.246 (0.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jailed Father</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.048)</td>
<td>(0.051)</td>
<td>(0.055)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint F-test (p-value) for all covariates</td>
<td>1.01 (0.46)</td>
<td>0.77 (0.94)</td>
<td>1.17 (0.28)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Standard errors clustered on the school are in parentheses, *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Each model includes controls for military-specific variables, including binary indicators for current active-duty military service status, total service length, military rank, branch of service, timing of service, occupation, and the timing of the interview. Coefficient(s) and standard error(s) are separately estimated for each variable (group). Each specification also includes dummies for missing information. The sample is comprised of male servicemembers only.
Table 3B: Evidence on the Exogeneity of Deployment Assignment (HRBADP Survey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Combat Exposure vs No Combat Exposure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Education</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.038)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint F-test (p-value) for Education</td>
<td>0.94 (0.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Squared</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint F-test (p-value) for Age</td>
<td>0.04 (0.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Other</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.033)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint F-test (p-value) for Race</td>
<td>0.04(0.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.033)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.023)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.055)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint F-test (p-value) for Education</td>
<td>0.15 (0.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint F-test (p-value) for all covariates</td>
<td>0.71(0.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>3,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors corrected for clustering on the stratum are in parentheses. *, **, and *** indicate statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels respectively. The sample consists of a sample in which each active duty deployed serviceman is matched on military characteristics available in the HRB survey: military rank, branch of service, and branch specific major command. The final sample is that which has common support on these characteristics.
Table 4: The Effect of Combat Deployments on Crime, by Whether Combat Exposure Occurred (Add Health)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Property Crime</td>
<td>Violent Crime</td>
<td>White Collar Crime</td>
<td>Drug Crime</td>
<td>Arrested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel I: Military Controls</td>
<td>Combat Deployment</td>
<td>0.092***</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.037**</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.034)</td>
<td>(0.053)</td>
<td>(0.017)</td>
<td>(0.021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel II: Military Controls</td>
<td>Combat Exposure</td>
<td>0.093**</td>
<td>0.118*</td>
<td>0.031*</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.043)</td>
<td>(0.067)</td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combat Deployment without Exposure</td>
<td>0.091**</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.042*</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.035)</td>
<td>(0.057)</td>
<td>(0.022)</td>
<td>(0.022)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel III: Panel II + Background Controls</td>
<td>Combat Exposure</td>
<td>0.076*</td>
<td>0.132*</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.048*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.043)</td>
<td>(0.068)</td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combat Deployment without Exposure</td>
<td>0.096**</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.038)</td>
<td>(0.056)</td>
<td>(0.023)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel IV: Panel III + Pre-Enlistment Crime</td>
<td>Combat Exposure</td>
<td>0.076*</td>
<td>0.138**</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.049*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.043)</td>
<td>(0.069)</td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combat Deployment without Exposure</td>
<td>0.114***</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.037)</td>
<td>(0.060)</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
<td>(0.029)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations: 480

Robust standard errors corrected for clustering on the school are in parentheses. Number of observations is in brackets. *, **, and *** indicate statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels respectively. Military Controls include binary indicators for current active-duty military service status, total service length, military rank, branch of service, service exclusively after September 11, occupation, and the timing of the interview. Individual and family controls include height, weight, religion indicators, age, age squared, race/ethnicity indicators, Wave 1 Picture Vocabulary Test Score, parental income dummies, parental marital status indicators, maternal education, and number of siblings indicators. Models also include missing dummy categories for each of the control variables with missing information. The sample is comprised of men only.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Property Crime</td>
<td>Violent Crime</td>
<td>White Collar Crime</td>
<td>Drug Crime</td>
<td>Arrested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panel I: Current Active Duty Sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat Exposure</td>
<td>-0.113</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.087)</td>
<td>(0.136)</td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
<td>(0.022)</td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat Deployment without Exposure</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.078)</td>
<td>(0.141)</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
<td>(0.023)</td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panel II: Past Active Duty Sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat Exposure</td>
<td>0.112*</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.060)</td>
<td>(0.086)</td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
<td>(0.041)</td>
<td>(0.036)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat Deployment without Exposure</td>
<td>0.190***</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.052)</td>
<td>(0.089)</td>
<td>(0.042)</td>
<td>(0.047)</td>
<td>(0.053)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors corrected for clustering on the school are in parentheses. Number of observations is in brackets. *, **, and *** indicate statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels respectively. Military Controls include binary indicators for current active-duty military service status, total service length, military rank, branch of service, service exclusively after September 11, occupation, and the timing of the interview. Individual and family controls include height, weight, religion indicators, age, age squared, race/ethnicity indicators, Wave 1 Picture Vocabulary Test Score, parental income dummies, parental marital status indicators, maternal education, and number of siblings indicators. Models also include missing dummy categories for each of the control variables with missing information. The sample is comprised of men only.
Table 6: Estimated Effect of Combat Exposure on Crime (HRBADP Survey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UCMJ</td>
<td>Trouble Police</td>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>Fight</td>
<td>Gang Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panel I: Military Controls Only</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled Sample</td>
<td>0.025***</td>
<td>0.022***</td>
<td>0.005***</td>
<td>0.035***</td>
<td>0.017***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>11,542</td>
<td>11,511</td>
<td>11,542</td>
<td>11,512</td>
<td>11,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panel II: Military + Background Controls</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled Sample</td>
<td>0.026***</td>
<td>0.023***</td>
<td>0.005***</td>
<td>0.037***</td>
<td>0.017***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>11,542</td>
<td>11,511</td>
<td>11,542</td>
<td>11,512</td>
<td>11,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panel III: Nearest Neighbor Matching Estimates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled Sample</td>
<td>0.020***</td>
<td>0.024***</td>
<td>0.0034***</td>
<td>0.036***</td>
<td>0.014***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.0013)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>[3,100]</td>
<td>[3,100]</td>
<td>[3,100]</td>
<td>[3,100]</td>
<td>[3,100]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panel IV: Army</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Sample</td>
<td>0.043**</td>
<td>0.045***</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.051***</td>
<td>0.027**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>2,563</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>2,563</td>
<td>2,556</td>
<td>2,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panel V: Marines</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marines</td>
<td>0.036**</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.035*</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>2,507</td>
<td>2,501</td>
<td>2,507</td>
<td>2,498</td>
<td>2,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panel VI: Navy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy</td>
<td>0.023**</td>
<td>0.033***</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.066***</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>3,374</td>
<td>3,371</td>
<td>3,374</td>
<td>3,367</td>
<td>3,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panel VII: Air Force</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.008***</td>
<td>0.015***</td>
<td>0.008**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>3,098</td>
<td>3,089</td>
<td>3,098</td>
<td>3,091</td>
<td>3,068</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Panels I, II, IV, V, VI, and VII Robust standard errors corrected for clustering on the stratum are in parentheses. In Panel III, bootstrapped standard errors with 500 replications are in parentheses. Number of observations is in brackets. *, **, and *** indicate statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels respectively. Each model controls for military rank, branch of service, branch specific major command indicators, education dummies, age, age squared, and race/ethnicity dummies. The sample is comprised of men only.
Table 7: Heterogeneity in Crime Effects of Combat Exposure, by Servicemen Characteristics (HRBADP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UCMJ</td>
<td>Trouble</td>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>Fight</td>
<td>Gang Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>punishment</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panel I: Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 18-to-24</td>
<td>0.034*</td>
<td>0.038*</td>
<td>0.009*</td>
<td>0.058***</td>
<td>0.031**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.017)</td>
<td>(0.021)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.018)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,545</td>
<td>2,535</td>
<td>2,545</td>
<td>2,535</td>
<td>2,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 25-to-32</td>
<td>0.036***</td>
<td>0.019*</td>
<td>0.008**</td>
<td>0.041***</td>
<td>0.020***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,872</td>
<td>3,859</td>
<td>3,872</td>
<td>3,860</td>
<td>3,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 33 to 50</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.014*</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,057</td>
<td>5,050</td>
<td>5,057</td>
<td>5,050</td>
<td>5,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panel II: Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>0.026**</td>
<td>0.021***</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.027**</td>
<td>0.008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,169</td>
<td>3,161</td>
<td>3,169</td>
<td>3,159</td>
<td>3,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panel III: E vs O Rank</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlisted</td>
<td>0.027***</td>
<td>0.025***</td>
<td>0.006***</td>
<td>0.039***</td>
<td>0.018***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8,792</td>
<td>8,764</td>
<td>8,792</td>
<td>8,764</td>
<td>8,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,682</td>
<td>2,680</td>
<td>2,682</td>
<td>2,681</td>
<td>2,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panel IV: Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic White</td>
<td>0.025***</td>
<td>0.018**</td>
<td>0.004*</td>
<td>0.023***</td>
<td>0.008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7,361</td>
<td>7,346</td>
<td>7,361</td>
<td>7,344</td>
<td>7,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.012*</td>
<td>0.006***</td>
<td>0.024***</td>
<td>0.010**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,075</td>
<td>8,378</td>
<td>8,399</td>
<td>8,378</td>
<td>8,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors corrected for clustering on the stratum are in parentheses. Number of observations is in brackets. *, **, and *** indicate statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels respectively. Each model controls for military rank, branch of service, branch specific major command indicators, education dummies, age, age squared, race/ethnicity dummies, and marital status indicators. The sample is comprised of men only.
Table 8: Disentangling Combat Exposure Effects from Number and Length of Combat Deployments (HRBADP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel</th>
<th>Punishment</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combat Exposure</td>
<td>0.026***</td>
<td>0.022***</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Post-9/11 Deployments</td>
<td>0.003*</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months Deployed Last Year</td>
<td>0.002**</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>11,497</td>
<td>11,430</td>
<td>11,400</td>
<td>11,369</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Panel II: Trouble Police

| Combat Exposure | 0.023*** | 0.019*** | 0.006 | 0.006 |
| Number of Post-9/11 Deployments | 0.005*** | 0.003* | 0.002 | 0.002 |
| Months Deployed Last Year | 0.002* | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 |
| Observations | 11,466 | 11,400 | 11,371 | 11,340 |

Panel III: Arrest

| Combat Exposure | 0.005*** | 0.005*** | 0.002 | 0.001 |
| Number of Post-9/11 Deployments | 0.000 | -0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Months Deployed Last Year | 0.000* | 0.000 | 0.001 | 0.000 |
| Observations | 11,497 | 11,430 | 11,400 | 11,369 |

Panel IV: Fight

| Combat Exposure | 0.036*** | 0.030*** | 0.006 | 0.007 |
| Number of Post-9/11 Deployments | 0.006*** | 0.003* | 0.002 | 0.002 |
| Months Deployed Last Year | 0.002*** | 0.001* | 0.001 | 0.001 |
| Observations | 11,467 | 11,401 | 11,372 | 11,341 |

Panel V: Gang Member

| Combat Exposure | 0.016*** | 0.012*** | 0.004 | 0.003 |
| Number of Post-9/11 Deployments | 0.004*** | 0.002** | 0.001 | 0.001 |
| Months Deployed Last Year | 0.001** | 0.001 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Observations | 11,341 | 11,281 | 11,252 | 11,222 |

Notes: Standard errors clustered on the stratum are in parentheses. Statistically significant at *10%, **5%, ***1%. Regressions control for military rank, branch of service, branch-specific major command indicators, education indicators, age, age squared, race/ethnicity dummies, and marital status indicators. The sample includes men only.
Table 9: Estimates of Effect of Combat Exposure, by Intensity of Exposure (HRBADP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UCMJ</td>
<td>Trouble Police</td>
<td>Arrest</td>
<td>Fight</td>
<td>Gang Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panel I: Intensity of Combat Exposure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Intensity Combat Exposure</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.019***</td>
<td>0.005**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Intensity Combat Exposure</td>
<td>0.038***</td>
<td>0.035***</td>
<td>0.008***</td>
<td>0.068***</td>
<td>0.029***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>11,542</td>
<td>11,511</td>
<td>11,542</td>
<td>11,512</td>
<td>11,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panel II: Battlefield Trauma</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injured in Combat</td>
<td>0.067***</td>
<td>0.069***</td>
<td>0.010*</td>
<td>0.091***</td>
<td>0.092***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td>(0.024)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.022)</td>
<td>(0.018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnessed Ally Hurt</td>
<td>0.021**</td>
<td>0.012*</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.022***</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnessed Enemy Death</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.023**</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.060***</td>
<td>0.020***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>11,255</td>
<td>11,227</td>
<td>11,255</td>
<td>11,228</td>
<td>11,119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors corrected for clustering on the stratum are in parentheses. Number of observations is in brackets. *, **, and *** indicate statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels respectively. Each model controls for military rank, branch of service, branch specific major command indicators, education dummies, age, age squared, and race/ethnicity dummies. The sample is comprised of men only.
Table 10: Descriptive Analysis of Possible Mechanisms (HRBADP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UCMJ</td>
<td>Trouble Police</td>
<td>Arrest</td>
<td>Fight</td>
<td>Gang Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panel I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat Exposure</td>
<td>0.026***</td>
<td>0.023***</td>
<td>0.005***</td>
<td>0.037***</td>
<td>0.017***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panel II</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat Exposure</td>
<td>0.017***</td>
<td>0.017**</td>
<td>0.004**</td>
<td>0.023***</td>
<td>0.013***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBI</td>
<td>0.027***</td>
<td>0.018*</td>
<td>0.004**</td>
<td>0.039***</td>
<td>0.014***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panel III</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat Exposure</td>
<td>0.021***</td>
<td>0.017***</td>
<td>0.004**</td>
<td>0.030***</td>
<td>0.014***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTSD</td>
<td>0.063***</td>
<td>0.084***</td>
<td>0.007**</td>
<td>0.104***</td>
<td>0.050***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panel IV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat Exposure</td>
<td>0.025***</td>
<td>0.022***</td>
<td>0.005***</td>
<td>0.035***</td>
<td>0.017***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binge Drinking</td>
<td>0.015***</td>
<td>0.037***</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.053***</td>
<td>0.010***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panel V</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat Exposure</td>
<td>0.023***</td>
<td>0.020***</td>
<td>0.004***</td>
<td>0.032***</td>
<td>0.015***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Use</td>
<td>0.074***</td>
<td>0.095***</td>
<td>0.010**</td>
<td>0.125***</td>
<td>0.057***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panel VI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat Exposure</td>
<td>0.013**</td>
<td>0.012*</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.017**</td>
<td>0.010***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBI</td>
<td>0.021***</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.003*</td>
<td>0.027***</td>
<td>0.009**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTSD</td>
<td>0.051***</td>
<td>0.068***</td>
<td>0.005*</td>
<td>0.080***</td>
<td>0.041***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binge Drinking</td>
<td>0.009**</td>
<td>0.029**</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.043***</td>
<td>0.005**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Use</td>
<td>0.064***</td>
<td>0.080***</td>
<td>0.008**</td>
<td>0.105***</td>
<td>0.050***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>11,542</td>
<td>11,511</td>
<td>11,542</td>
<td>11,512</td>
<td>11,386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors corrected for clustering on the stratum are in parentheses. Number of observations is in brackets. *, **, and *** indicate statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels respectively. Each model controls for military rank, branch of service, branch specific major command indicators, education dummies, age, age squared, and race/ethnicity dummies. The sample is comprised of men only.
### Appendix Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Control Variables by Combat Assignment

*(Add Health)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Sample</th>
<th>Combat Zone</th>
<th>Non-Combat Zone</th>
<th>Combat Exposure</th>
<th>Combat Service no Exposure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Deployment Property Crime</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
<td>(0.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Deployment Violent Crime</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
<td>(0.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Deployment Drug Crime</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.31)</td>
<td>(0.28)</td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
<td>(0.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Deployment Arrest</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.19)</td>
<td>(0.19)</td>
<td>(0.18)</td>
<td>(0.23)</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>68.60</td>
<td>68.39</td>
<td>69.21</td>
<td>68.58</td>
<td>68.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.86)</td>
<td>(3.84)</td>
<td>(3.89)</td>
<td>(4.05)</td>
<td>(3.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>146.36</td>
<td>144.63</td>
<td>151.73</td>
<td>145.80</td>
<td>143.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(29.97)</td>
<td>(29.97)</td>
<td>(29.48)</td>
<td>(29.62)</td>
<td>(30.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 1 Protestant</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
<td>(0.47)</td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 1 Catholic</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.43)</td>
<td>(0.44)</td>
<td>(0.38)</td>
<td>(0.42)</td>
<td>(0.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 1 Other Religion</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.19)</td>
<td>(0.19)</td>
<td>(0.18)</td>
<td>(0.18)</td>
<td>(0.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age in Years</td>
<td>28.68</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>29.03</td>
<td>28.49</td>
<td>28.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.70)</td>
<td>(1.73)</td>
<td>(1.57)</td>
<td>(1.76)</td>
<td>(1.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Black</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
<td>(0.42)</td>
<td>(0.39)</td>
<td>(0.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Other</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.27)</td>
<td>(0.29)</td>
<td>(0.20)</td>
<td>(0.24)</td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity: Hispanic</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
<td>(0.36)</td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.47)</td>
<td>(0.47)</td>
<td>(0.48)</td>
<td>(0.47)</td>
<td>(0.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
<td>(0.36)</td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
<td>(0.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 1 PPVTS</td>
<td>103.66</td>
<td>103.67</td>
<td>103.64</td>
<td>103.86</td>
<td>103.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13.39)</td>
<td>(13.70)</td>
<td>(12.49)</td>
<td>(14.87)</td>
<td>(12.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$19K=&lt;Parental Income &lt;$28K</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
<td>(0.35)</td>
<td>(0.42)</td>
<td>(0.36)</td>
<td>(0.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$28K=&lt;Parental Income &lt;$36K</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.34)</td>
<td>(0.35)</td>
<td>(0.31)</td>
<td>(0.38)</td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$36K=&lt;Parental Income &lt;$45K</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.36)</td>
<td>(0.36)</td>
<td>(0.36)</td>
<td>(0.35)</td>
<td>(0.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45K=&lt;Parental Income &lt;$56K</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.39)</td>
<td>(0.39)</td>
<td>(0.38)</td>
<td>(0.39)</td>
<td>(0.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full Sample</td>
<td>Combat Zone</td>
<td>Non-Combat Zone</td>
<td>Combat Exposure</td>
<td>Combat Service no Exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$56K=&lt;Parental Income &lt;$83K</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
<td>(0.33)</td>
<td>(0.28)</td>
<td>(0.31)</td>
<td>(0.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$83K=&gt;Parental Income</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.24)</td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
<td>(0.21)</td>
<td>(0.26)</td>
<td>(0.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents: Married</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.43)</td>
<td>(0.44)</td>
<td>(0.42)</td>
<td>(0.45)</td>
<td>(0.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents: Divorced, Separated or Widowed</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
<td>(0.42)</td>
<td>(0.42)</td>
<td>(0.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One sibling</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
<td>(0.42)</td>
<td>(0.38)</td>
<td>(0.43)</td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two siblings</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.43)</td>
<td>(0.42)</td>
<td>(0.44)</td>
<td>(0.43)</td>
<td>(0.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three siblings</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
<td>(0.42)</td>
<td>(0.40)</td>
<td>(0.42)</td>
<td>(0.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four siblings</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.31)</td>
<td>(0.29)</td>
<td>(0.34)</td>
<td>(0.29)</td>
<td>(0.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five or more siblings</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.40)</td>
<td>(0.40)</td>
<td>(0.40)</td>
<td>(0.39)</td>
<td>(0.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jailed Father</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.39)</td>
<td>(0.38)</td>
<td>(0.44)</td>
<td>(0.39)</td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
<td>(0.47)</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
<td>(0.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marines</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.40)</td>
<td>(0.39)</td>
<td>(0.44)</td>
<td>(0.44)</td>
<td>(0.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.43)</td>
<td>(0.42)</td>
<td>(0.45)</td>
<td>(0.31)</td>
<td>(0.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
<td>(0.38)</td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
<td>(0.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank E4-E6</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.36)</td>
<td>(0.34)</td>
<td>(0.39)</td>
<td>(0.33)</td>
<td>(0.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank E7-E8</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.14)</td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank W1-W2</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.08)</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(0.11)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank O1-O3</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
<td>(0.26)</td>
<td>(0.20)</td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
<td>(0.26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations  482  364  118  177  187

Standard deviations in parentheses
Appendix Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for Control Variables by Combat Exposure and Branch of Service (HRBADP Survey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Combat Exposure</th>
<th>Non-Combat Exposure</th>
<th>Army</th>
<th>Marines</th>
<th>Navy</th>
<th>Air Force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
<td>(0.48)</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Education</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.44)</td>
<td>(0.45)</td>
<td>(0.44)</td>
<td>(0.44)</td>
<td>(0.46)</td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
<td>(0.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>31.61</td>
<td>31.79</td>
<td>31.41</td>
<td>31.36</td>
<td>30.78</td>
<td>31.51</td>
<td>32.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.63)</td>
<td>(7.54)</td>
<td>(7.71)</td>
<td>(7.56)</td>
<td>(7.86)</td>
<td>(7.60)</td>
<td>(7.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.36)</td>
<td>(0.35)</td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
<td>(0.39)</td>
<td>(0.30)</td>
<td>(0.39)</td>
<td>(0.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Other</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
<td>(0.30)</td>
<td>(0.34)</td>
<td>(0.30)</td>
<td>(0.28)</td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
<td>(0.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.33)</td>
<td>(0.34)</td>
<td>(0.33)</td>
<td>(0.35)</td>
<td>(0.35)</td>
<td>(0.33)</td>
<td>(0.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.42)</td>
<td>(0.48)</td>
<td>(0.29)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
<td>(0.46)</td>
<td>(0.34)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.45)</td>
<td>(0.33)</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.44)</td>
<td>(0.42)</td>
<td>(0.46)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank E4-E6</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank E7-E9</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
<td>(0.35)</td>
<td>(0.36)</td>
<td>(0.38)</td>
<td>(0.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank W1-W5</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.19)</td>
<td>(0.23)</td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
<td>(0.26)</td>
<td>(0.28)</td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank O1-O3</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.30)</td>
<td>(0.30)</td>
<td>(0.29)</td>
<td>(0.30)</td>
<td>(0.33)</td>
<td>(0.26)</td>
<td>(0.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank 04-O10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.29)</td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
<td>(0.27)</td>
<td>(0.26)</td>
<td>(0.35)</td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
<td>(0.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>11542</td>
<td>5948</td>
<td>5594</td>
<td>2563</td>
<td>2507</td>
<td>3374</td>
<td>3098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard deviations in parentheses
Appendix Table 3: Sensitivity of Add Health Estimates to HRBADP Survey Controls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Property</td>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Drug</td>
<td>Arrested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>Collar</td>
<td>Crime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel I: Effect of Combat Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRBADP Controls Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat Zone Deployment</td>
<td>0.085***</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.036**</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.029)</td>
<td>(0.048)</td>
<td>(0.017)</td>
<td>(0.022)</td>
<td>(0.018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Controls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat Zone Deployment</td>
<td>0.092***</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.037**</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.034)</td>
<td>(0.053)</td>
<td>(0.017)</td>
<td>(0.021)</td>
<td>(0.018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel II: Effect of Combat Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRBADP Controls Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat Exposure</td>
<td>0.071**</td>
<td>0.127**</td>
<td>0.035**</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.034)</td>
<td>(0.062)</td>
<td>(0.018)</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
<td>(0.022)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat Zone without Exposure</td>
<td>0.098***</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.037*</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.035)</td>
<td>(0.054)</td>
<td>(0.022)</td>
<td>(0.024)</td>
<td>(0.022)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Controls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat Exposure</td>
<td>0.076*</td>
<td>0.138**</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.049*</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.043)</td>
<td>(0.069)</td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
<td>(0.022)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat Zone without Exposure</td>
<td>0.114***</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.037)</td>
<td>(0.060)</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
<td>(0.029)</td>
<td>(0.027)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations: 480 480 480 480 480 480

Standard errors corrected for clustering on the school are in parentheses. Number of observations is in brackets. *, **, and *** indicate statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels respectively. All models control for age, age squared, race/ethnicity indicators, education indicators, military rank, and branch of service. Models also include missing dummy categories for each of the control variables. In every model estimated those who are deployed to a non-combat zone constitute the comparison group.
Appendix Table 4: Marginal Effects from Probit Estimates of the Effect of Combat Exposure on Crime (HRBADP Survey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1) UCMJ punishment</th>
<th>(2) Trouble Police</th>
<th>(3) Arrested</th>
<th>(4) Fight</th>
<th>(5) Gang Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panel I: Military Controls Only</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled Sample</td>
<td>0.021***</td>
<td>0.019***</td>
<td>0.001***</td>
<td>0.030***</td>
<td>0.003***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>11,542</td>
<td>11,511</td>
<td>11,542</td>
<td>11,512</td>
<td>11,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panel II: Military + Background Controls</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled Sample</td>
<td>0.020***</td>
<td>0.019***</td>
<td>0.001***</td>
<td>0.029***</td>
<td>0.001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>11,542</td>
<td>11,511</td>
<td>11,542</td>
<td>11,512</td>
<td>11,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panel III: Army</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Sample</td>
<td>0.031***</td>
<td>0.035***</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.040***</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>2,563</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>2,563</td>
<td>2,556</td>
<td>2,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panel IV: Marines</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marines</td>
<td>0.022***</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.021**</td>
<td>0.003***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>2,507</td>
<td>2,501</td>
<td>2,507</td>
<td>2,498</td>
<td>2,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panel V: Navy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy</td>
<td>0.012***</td>
<td>0.031***</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.040***</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>3,374</td>
<td>3,371</td>
<td>3,374</td>
<td>3,367</td>
<td>3,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panel VI: Air Force</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.004***</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>3,098</td>
<td>3,089</td>
<td>3,098</td>
<td>3,091</td>
<td>3,068</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard errors corrected for clustering on the stratum are in parentheses. Number of observations is in brackets. *, **, and *** indicate statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels respectively. Each model controls for military rank, branch of service, branch specific major command indicators, education dummies, age, age squared, and race/ethnicity dummies. The sample is comprised of men only.
Appendix Table 5: The Impact of Combat Zone Deployment with Engagement (Enemy Firefight) on Selected Mechanisms (HRBADP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TBI</td>
<td>PTSD</td>
<td>Binge Drinking</td>
<td>Drug Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat Exposure</td>
<td>0.370***</td>
<td>0.068***</td>
<td>0.037***</td>
<td>0.032***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>11,253</td>
<td>11,427</td>
<td>11,073</td>
<td>11,514</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors corrected for clustering on the stratum are in parentheses. Number of observations is in brackets. *, **, and *** indicate statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels respectively. Each model controls for military rank, branch of service, branch specific major command indicators, education dummies, age, age squared, race/ethnicity dummies, and marital status indicators. The sample is comprised of men only.
A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AURORA, COLORADO, EXPRESSING THE AURORA CITY COUNCIL’S SUPPORT FOR CREATING A VETERANS TREATMENT COURT WITHIN THE AURORA MUNICIPAL COURT

WHEREAS, the City of Aurora is dedicated to providing resources through a Veterans Treatment Court to support the veterans that live in our community; and

WHEREAS, a Veterans Treatment Court helps transform the way the justice system identifies, assesses, and treats veterans that have been charged with crimes in court; and

WHEREAS, a Veterans Treatment Court provides support to ensure that no veteran is left behind by providing resources to directly serve veterans involved in the criminal justice system due to mental health disorders, trauma, and substance use; and

WHEREAS, a Veterans Treatment Court can connect veterans with the benefits and treatment they have earned through their service to our country; and

WHEREAS, Justice for Vets, in partnership with the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) developed the Veterans Treatment Court Planning Initiative (VTCPI) training program for jurisdictions interested in the implementation of a veterans treatment court (VTC); and

WHEREAS, the City of Aurora applied and has been accepted by Justice for Vets to participate in the VTCPI training program; and

WHEREAS, to participate in VTCPI training, each jurisdiction must identify multiple individuals representing specific disciplines to form a VTC planning team; and

WHEREAS, community support for the formation of a City of Aurora VTC includes the Veterans Affairs Commission, the Aurora Chamber of Commerce, the 17th and 18th Judicial District Veteran Treatment Courts, community groups such as WarriorNOW, and many more.

WHEREAS, the Justice for Vets staff will work with the City of Aurora planning team, using best practice standards to shape program plans, develop policy and procedure manuals, and foster team unity; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AURORA, COLORADO THAT:

Section 1. The Aurora City Council resolves as follows:
The employees of the City are hereby authorized and directed to take such further action as may be necessary or desirable to comply with the intent of this Resolution and to carry out, comply with and perform the duties of the City with respect to the creation and implementation of a Veterans Treatment Court within the Aurora Municipal Court.

Section 2. This Resolution shall take effect immediately without reconsideration.

RESOLVED AND PASSED this _____ day of ___________________. 2020.

_______________________
MIKE COFFMAN, Mayor

ATTEST:

_______________________
STEPHEN RUGER, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

_______________________
Julie A. Heckman, Deputy City Attorney