



IntegrAssure

OFFICE OF THE INDEPENDENT CONSENT DECREE MONITOR FOR THE CITY OF AURORA

Report of the Independent Consent Decree Monitor

Reporting Period 1 Covering February 15- May 15, 2022

Issued: July 15, 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	5
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL’S INVESTIGATION	6
THE CONSENT DECREE	7
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	8
THE ROLE OF THE MONITOR.....	9
THE MONITORING TEAM.....	9
THE COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCIL	10
THE MONITOR’S METHODOLOGY	10
FOUNDATIONAL PRECEPTS AND PARADIGM	11
FIRST QUARTER ORGANIZATION AND ACTIVITIES	12
CORE MONITORING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	14
METHODOLOGIES TO AID IN THE DETERMINATION OF COMPLIANCE.....	14
REPORT CARD	15
SURVEY OF COMMUNITY SENTIMENT	15
FOCUS ISSUES	15
THE TERMINATION OF CHIEF VANESSA WILSON	15
SIGNIFICANT EFFORTS AT IMPROVING POLICE-COMMUNITY RELATIONS.....	16
SYSTEMS TO ENSURE BEST PRACTICE POLICING	17
FIRST LINE SUPERVISION	18
EARLY INTERVENTION.....	19
INTERNAL AFFAIRS AND CIVILIAN COMPLAINT INVESTIGATION PROCESS	20
DISCIPLINARY PROCESS	21
DATA ANALYSIS	22
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION.....	23
CUSTOMER SERVICE FEEDBACK.....	24
AUDIT AND INSPECTION.....	24
POST-INCIDENT REVIEW PROCESS	25

WHEN SYSTEMS ARE NOT OPERATING OPTIMALLY	26
MAY 15, 2021 TRAFFIC STOP INCIDENT	27
HOW THE SYSTEMS SHOULD WORK	32
 ASSESSMENT OF MANDATES THIS REPORTING PERIOD	 34
 POLICIES AND TRAINING GENERALLY	 35
INTRODUCTION	35
ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 1.....	35
ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 3.....	37
ADDRESSING RACIAL BIAS IN POLICING	37
INTRODUCTION	37
HISTORY AND BASIS FOR CONSENT DECREE MANDATES.....	38
CONSENT DECREE’S OBJECTIVES	39
POLICY IMPLICATIONS	39
TRAINING IMPLICATIONS.....	39
OPERATIONAL INTEGRITY IMPLICATIONS.....	40
DATA UTILIZATION	40
PROGRESS AND NOTABLE OBSERVATIONS FROM THIS REPORTING PERIOD	40
THIS REPORTING PERIOD’S ASSESSMENTS OF INDIVIDUAL MANDATES IN THE SECTION	41
USE OF FORCE	42
INTRODUCTION	42
HISTORY AND BASIS FOR CONSENT DECREE MANDATES.....	43
CONSENT DECREE’S OBJECTIVES	43
POLICY IMPLICATIONS	44
TRAINING IMPLICATIONS.....	44
OPERATIONAL INTEGRITY IMPLICATIONS.....	44
DATA UTILIZATION	44
PROGRESS AND NOTABLE OBSERVATIONS FROM THIS REPORTING PERIOD.....	45
THIS REPORTING PERIOD’S ASSESSMENTS OF INDIVIDUAL MANDATES IN THE SECTION	46
DOCUMENTATION OF STOPS	54
INTRODUCTION	54
HISTORY AND BASIS FOR CONSENT DECREE MANDATES.....	55
CONSENT DECREE’S OBJECTIVES	56
POLICY IMPLICATIONS	56
TRAINING IMPLICATIONS.....	56
OPERATIONAL INTEGRITY IMPLICATIONS.....	56
DATA UTILIZATION	56
PROGRESS AND NOTABLE OBSERVATIONS FROM THIS REPORTING PERIOD.....	57
THIS REPORTING PERIOD’S ASSESSMENTS OF INDIVIDUAL MANDATES IN THE SECTION	58

USE OF KETAMINE AND OTHER SEDATIVES AS CHEMICAL RESTRAINT	61
INTRODUCTION	61
HISTORY AND BASIS FOR CONSENT DECREE MANDATES.....	62
CONSENT DECREE’S OBJECTIVES	63
POLICY IMPLICATIONS	63
TRAINING IMPLICATIONS.....	63
OPERATIONAL INTEGRITY IMPLICATIONS.....	64
DATA UTILIZATION	64
PROGRESS AND NOTABLE OBSERVATIONS FROM THIS REPORTING PERIOD	64
THIS REPORTING PERIOD’S ASSESSMENTS OF INDIVIDUAL MANDATES IN THE SECTION	64
RECRUITMENT, HIRING AND PROMOTION	72
INTRODUCTION	72
HISTORY AND BASIS FOR CONSENT DECREE MANDATES.....	73
CONSENT DECREE OBJECTIVES.....	74
POLICY IMPLICATIONS	74
TRAINING IMPLICATIONS.....	74
OPERATIONAL INTEGRITY IMPLICATIONS.....	74
DATA UTILIZATION	74
PROGRESS AND NOTABLE OBSERVATIONS FROM THE REPORTING PERIOD	75
THIS REPORTING PERIOD’S ASSESSMENTS OF INDIVIDUAL MANDATES IN THE SECTION	75
ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY	85
INTRODUCTION	85
HISTORY AND BASIS FOR CONSENT DECREE MANDATES.....	86
CONSENT DECREE OBJECTIVES.....	86
POLICY IMPLICATIONS	87
TRAINING IMPLICATIONS.....	87
OPERATIONAL INTEGRITY IMPLICATIONS.....	87
DATA UTILIZATION	87
PROGRESS AND NOTABLE OBSERVATIONS FROM THIS REPORTING PERIOD.....	87
THIS REPORTING PERIOD’S ASSESSMENTS OF INDIVIDUAL MANDATES IN THE SECTION	87
<u>UPCOMING ACTIVITIES.....</u>	<u>88</u>
<u>CONCLUSION</u>	<u>88</u>
<u>APPENDIX A – REPORT CARD</u>	<u>88</u>
<u>APPENDIX B – THE MONITORING TEAM BIOS.....</u>	<u>88</u>
<u>APPENDIX C – COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCIL BIOS</u>	<u>88</u>

APPENDIX D – THE CONSENT DECREE	88
APPENDIX E - METHODOLOGIES TO AID IN THE DETERMINATION OF COMPLIANCE (MADC)	88
APPENDIX F - INTERIM REPORT TO THE PARTIES	89
APPENDIX G – SURVEY RESULTS	89

INTRODUCTION

This is the first¹ of twelve scheduled reports that the Independent Consent Decree Monitor for the City of Aurora (the Monitor) will produce, detailing the progress that has been made by the City, the Aurora Police Department (APD), Aurora Fire-Rescue (AFR), and the Aurora Civil Service Commission (CSC) in reforming these agencies pursuant to the mandates contained in what is known as the Consent Decree (the “Decree”). This reform process was brought about by the in-custody death of Elijah McClain and other events which set in motion an investigation by the Colorado Attorney General and subsequent litigation that was resolved with the agreement by the City of Aurora to enter the Consent Decree.²

Implicated in the Attorney General’s investigation and the resultant Consent Decree are policies, training and systems of accountability that were found not to be operating properly in Aurora. These deficits failed not only the residents of Aurora who want, and deserve, public safety in their community to be based on best practices, but also failed Aurora officers and firefighters who, to some extent, have lost the trust of those they serve, when each entered the profession only to do the right thing and relied on the system to properly guide them.

The purpose of the Consent Decree is to make certain that these systems are reformed and that every possible effort is made, in every possible area of public safety, to do all that can be done to prevent another Elijah McClain incident.

Much to their credit, Aurora leadership at the City level and in both the APD and AFR, as well as the vast majority of rank-and-file members of each department with whom we have spoken, have embraced the need for change, and recognize that a culture of continuous improvement is one that will benefit all. The City and its agencies have, up until this point, have cooperated with the Monitor in every way possible, which bodes extremely well for the outcome of the Monitorship process. It has been stated by leadership of both the APD and AFR that their goal is to make their Departments all that they can and should be.

Through the implementation of the best practices called for by the Decree, including a system that affords transparency, provides clear guidance for officers, is appropriately critical in its evaluation of performance, mentors officers who need course correction such as additional or

¹ The Monitor issued an interim report in letter form to the parties on April 1, 2022, calling out the activities of the Monitor during the first 45 days of the engagement. The letter is attached as Appendix F.

² A copy of the Consent Decree is contained in Appendix D.

remedial training, or counseling, and a system that appropriately disciplines those who significantly deviate from Department standards, there is little question that Aurora can be a national model of public safety. The Monitor has seen this happen in other cities, large and small, and has witnessed first-hand that through these changes community trust is built, crime reduction occurs, and officer-safety is improved.

This report constitutes the first report of the Monitor, covering the first Reporting Period (“RP1”) from February 15, 2022, to May 15, 2022.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL’S INVESTIGATION

On June 19, 2020, the Colorado legislature passed Senate Bill 217 which among other reforms gave the Attorney General of the State the ability to investigate “patterns and practices” of police departments in the State for engaging in a pattern or practice of depriving persons of their rights as guaranteed by the constitutions and laws of both the United States and the state of Colorado.³

The Attorney General of Colorado (AG) commenced an investigation pursuant to this authority in August 2020 into the Aurora Police Department (APD) and Aurora Fire Rescue (AFR). The investigation resulted in a report (“AG Report”)⁴ which found that APD had indeed engaged in a pattern and practice of (1) racially biased policing against people of color as a whole and Black people in particular; (2) using force excessively; and (3) failing to document all vehicle and pedestrian stops, as required by state law. The AG Report also found that AFR was engaged in a pattern and practice of using Ketamine, a chemical sedative, in violation of the law.

The AG Report went on to find that underlying these patterns and practices, at least with respect to APD, was the failure of a variety systems and a culture which did not recognize nor address the shortcomings. With respect to the disciplinary system, the AG Report found significant issues with the Aurora Civil Service Commission (CSC), where the Commission undermined the authority of the Chief of Police by overturning their decisions on discipline. And lastly, the AG Report found that because of CSC hiring practices, that APD was not reflective of the diversity of the City.

The AG Report was issued on September 15, 2021, and, pursuant to the statute, started a minimum sixty day period of interaction with the City of Aurora, before litigation could be commenced. On November 23, 2021, a complaint was filed in the District Court of Arapahoe County, followed by the filing of a joint motion settling the lawsuit with a Consent Decree, which

³ Senate Bill 217 Section 24-31-113

⁴ Office of the Colorado Attorney General, [Investigation of the Aurora Police Department and Aurora Fire Rescue](#)

detailed the agreement of the Attorney General and the City of Aurora as to how the City would address the issues contained in the AG Report.

THE CONSENT DECREE

The Consent Decree and its embedded processes were modeled on that utilized by the US Department of Justice (DOJ), since the late 1990's⁵. It is, however the first such endeavor of the Colorado Attorney General under its new authority.

The Decree contains various mandates in different reform areas which the City has agreed to implement within certain time frames. The implementation is to be overseen by an "Independent Consent Decree Monitor" who is charged with not only auditing the implementation progress, but with providing technical assistance to the City, engaging the community to understand its concerns and frustrations, and measuring the impact of the Decree and the reforms which it brings about. The Monitor is also charged with issuing public reports, of which this is the first, at quarterly intervals during the first year of the Decree and bi-annually thereafter.

Each of the areas of failure cited in the Attorney General's Report is addressed with mandates in the Decree:

- Generally, the City agreed that APD and AFR will "develop comprehensive policies and procedures that ensure implementation" of the decree and "will work to ensure policies are consistent and complementary, conduct training to ensure coordinated responses, and hold officers and firefighters accountable for violating policy."
- With respect to biased policing, the City agreed to "change, in measurable ways, how [APD] engages with all members of the community, including by reducing any racial disparities in how [APD] engages, arrests, and uses force in the community."
- With respect to uses of force, the City agreed to "create improved policies and training to better equip officers to handle challenging situations in ways that reduce the use of force, ensure force is used in compliance with state and federal law, protect officer and community safety, and build a culture of continuous improvement."

⁵ Federal consent decrees came about as a result of a 1994 law which authorized the Attorney General of the United States to investigate cases involving "a pattern or practice of conduct by law enforcement officers" that violates Constitutional or federal rights (42 U.S.C Section 14141) and was first used in Pittsburgh, PA with a US Department of Justice (DOJ) investigation followed by a Consent Decree that began in April 1997 and ended in September of 2002. There have been more than 40 federal reform agreements since then.

- With respect to the documentation of stops, the City agreed “develop a documentation system that complies with state law, allows for prompt and transparent review of officer behavior, and improves the ability of [APD] to identify successes and areas for improvement.”
- With respect to the use of Ketamine, the City agreed that it would submit for review to [the Monitor] any proposal to resume use of ketamine as a chemical restraint during the monitorship period.
- With respect to discipline the City agreed that it would substantially “reduce the time disciplinary cases take from filing to resolution” and would “strongly consider not allowing a full “de novo” review of disciplinary cases by the Civil Service Commission.
- With respect to hiring, the City agreed that it would “transform [the] recruiting and hiring processes to create a more diverse and qualified workforce and establish APD and AFR commitments to a culture of continuous improvement and becoming better police and fire departments.”
- With regard to the general failure of systems and the culture which did not recognize or address the shortcomings, the City agreed to improve accountability and transparency by “develop[ing] systems that permit [APD] to regularly and easily identify trends and patterns in the conduct of its officers, including, but not limited to, conduct that repeatedly gives rise to claims of civil liability; conduct or specific officers implicated in multiple citizen or officer complaints; and repeated conduct that suggests a need for further training or policy review.”

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The first Reporting Period of the Consent Decree ended on May 15, 2022. During this initial period, the City of Aurora and its constituent agencies have cooperated fully with the Monitor and have begun working on, and in some cases have made great strides toward, the implementation of the mandated reforms. The Monitor and the City collaborated, with input from the AG’s Office, on establishing clear expectation and goals from the start of the process to provide a transparent roadmap to success. The Monitor has established a Community Advisory Council, a website and a formal scoring method that will be used to report the City’s progress in achieving the goals laid out within the roadmap to the public.

In addition to the start-up tasks noted above, during the first reporting period the Monitor examined 36 of 70 mandates of the Consent Decree finding nine of them to be in substantial compliance. Those mandates found to be in substantial compliance involved eight centered on Aurora Fire Rescue’s Use of Chemical Sedatives, as well as one involving the Civil Service Commission and its selection of an expert for its work on Recruitment, Hiring and Promotion.

Of the remaining 29 mandates examined, nine were found to be on a cautionary track, where there was some uncertainty as to whether the expectations of the Monitor would be fulfilled. The major concern in these mandates was the lack of governance over the process of policy and training revisions.

The remaining 20 mandates were found to be in various stages of movement toward substantial compliance in line with the Monitor's expectations.

In addition to reporting on these 36 mandates, we have included three focus issues for this Reporting Period and have provided context to this Report through an explanation of fundamental aspects of the Monitorship.

THE ROLE OF THE MONITOR

The Monitor is not involved in the day-to-day operation of APD, AFR, or the Civil Service Commission. Rather, the Monitor's main function is to audit and monitor and make sure that those agencies are meeting each of the mandates of the Decree—essentially to provide integrity assurance relative to mandates of the Decree. The Monitor will do this through a variety of methods which are documented in our Methodologies to Aid in the Determination of Compliance ("MADC"), fully described below. Although the MADDC anticipates scheduled reviews, the Monitor will be continuously on the lookout for significant deviations from individual mandates of the Decree or its underlying goals.

In addition to its auditing/integrity assurance functions, the Monitor will be providing technical assistance as requested by the City on those issues covered by the Decree.

Lastly, we will be publicly reporting our findings with recommendations four times during the first year of the Decree and twice a year thereafter.

THE MONITORING TEAM

On February 14, 2022, the City Council ratified the City's choice of IntegrAssure, LLC ("IntegrAssure") to serve as the Independent Consent Decree Monitor. IntegrAssure was founded in March 2021 by its President and Chief Executive Officer, Jeff Schlanger, immediately upon his retirement as the Deputy Commissioner of Risk Management Bureau for the New York City Police Department. The firm is dedicated to the proposition that police departments can (and must) continuously improve through a disciplined process of re-examination, re-engineering, and re-imagination of each area of concern. The Monitoring Team, led by Mr. Schlanger, consists of academics and experts who have implemented large-scale reform efforts

in multiple jurisdictions and team members who come from different roles as police executives, city executives, academics, and providers of civilian oversight. The Monitoring Team combines practical operational law enforcement expertise from around the country with academic research. Brief bios of the team members are attached as Appendix B.

THE COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCIL

As part of its mandate to engage the community in the Consent Decree process, the Community Advisory Council (CAC) was created in March 2022 by the Monitor to provide community input and guidance regarding the reform efforts of the City. The membership of the CAC will promote diversity of thought and information exchange for the duration of the Consent Decree. Essentially, the CAC will be the Monitor's eyes and ears in the community providing community perspectives and insight to the Monitor on matters related to each of the areas covered by the Decree. This will include reviewing the Monitor's findings on compliance on each of the Decree's mandates, raising Decree-related concerns from the community and the providing perspective on whether the mandated reforms are being felt on the streets of Aurora.

The CAC is led by three prominent members of the Aurora Community: Pastor Reid Hettich, Omar Montgomery, and Jeanette Rodriguez whose brief bios along with the bios of the members of the CAC are attached as Appendix C.

THE MONITOR'S METHODOLOGY

The key to success in this process lies in the combination of oversight and the provision of technical assistance called for by the Decree, and, of course, the willingness of the stakeholders to meaningfully engage and embrace the process. Moreover, a transparent methodology of how the Monitor will conduct that oversight and technical assistance, so as to set clear expectations and goals from the start of the process, is all-important to the success of the process.

Yet, even the best of policies and training, and the best methodology by which the Monitor will judge the degree of compliance, coupled with best intentions of stakeholders, will not, necessarily, result in the success of the Consent Decree. The processes called for by the Decree, need to rest on a strong cultural foundation of ethics and morality. While not explicitly called out in the Consent Decree, a foundation of ethics and morality is implicit in all that the Decree is expected to achieve.

FOUNDATIONAL PRECEPTS AND PARADIGM



The graphic above is the Monitor’s view of the public safety eco-system, with a strong moral foundation supporting pillars comprising the areas of police management, which in turn support the mission of the department and ultimately leads to the desired results of reduced crime, increased public trust and increased officer safety and wellness.

While the Monitor refers to the necessary cultural foundation as the “CHIEF Directives” the name of the that foundation is not important. Its purpose is of the utmost importance, however: to allow everyone within the department to understand the moral imperatives by which they must abide and serve, and guide their day-to-day duties and responsibilities.

The Monitor’s CHIEF Directives include the following foundational elements as stated from the perspective of a police officer in a given police department:

Courage

- I will continue every day to put my life on the line to serve and protect others to the best of my ability.
- I will always intervene when I observe a fellow officer acting inappropriately.

Humanity

- I will always respect the dignity and sanctity of life.
- I will always attempt to de-escalate every situation in which I can reasonably do so.
- I will only use force as a last resort and never use more force than is reasonably necessary to detain an individual or protect myself, my fellow officers, or those I serve from harm.

Integrity

- I will always be truthful and honest and will not suffer those who are not.
- I will always police judiciously and constitutionally in accordance with the law.

Empathy

- I will always treat others as I would want me, or my family members treated.
- I will always help those in need.
- I will always provide courteous, respectful, and professional service to those I am sworn to serve.

For All

- I will do each of the above for myself, my department, my community, and for everyone I am sworn to serve without bias for or against any individual or group.

The Monitor is not suggesting that Aurora needs to adopt this exact model. Rather, it is the Monitor's experience that a strong foundation can help shape culture and make the different aspects of police management, those that the Consent Decree addresses, easier to develop and execute. Recruitment will be of individuals who subscribe to the stated principles of the organization. Policies and training, and operational integrity will be derivative from the principles, and those who deviate from the principles will be held accountable. The mission of the department will be executed each day, and through it all, there will come enhanced public trust, enhanced public safety and enhanced officer wellness.

FIRST QUARTER ORGANIZATION AND ACTIVITIES

Establishing good working relationships with the parties and stakeholders in the Consent Decree is a critical first step in performing the monitoring assignment. Understanding the functions of department leadership in various areas and what they perceive as the strengths and weaknesses

and barriers to success in their areas of responsibility, is an indispensable part of the initial phase of the monitorship. The Monitor spent a significant portion of the first Reporting Period getting to know the stakeholders. While some of these meetings have been held virtually, the Monitoring Team has, during the first reporting period, spent considerable time in Aurora, visiting on three separate occasions lasting from three to five days each.

The Monitoring Team held meetings and interacted with a variety of police officers, firefighters, and city officials. Team members met on multiple occasions with the Chief of Police, Chief of AFR, numerous Deputy Chiefs and Commanders within the APD and AFR, the Civil Service Commission and its staff, and many sworn personnel of APD and AFR as well as other city employees.

Meetings were also held with the City Manager's Office, the City Attorney's Office, the Attorney General's Office, the Public Defender's Office, the Fraternal Order of Police (FOP) and International Association of Fire Fighters (IAFF)⁶, and the three Sheriffs whose jurisdictions overlap with APD. The Monitor met formally in two sessions with the CSC and in one session with the Public Safety Committee of the City Council.

Team members began reviewing policies, documents and reports and performed "ride alongs" with police officers and firefighters on duty. Team members also rode along with both the Crisis Response Team (CRT) and the Aurora Mobile Response Team (AMRT) the two units which have been set up to divert calls involving mental health issues away from patrol officers. The time invested to become familiar with issues facing Aurora and its officers has allowed the Monitor to begin an informed evaluation of the APD, AFR, and the CSC.

In addition, an organizational structure of the Monitor Team was implemented to best fulfill its function. The Monitor designated specific team members to the specific workstreams addressed in the Decree. Procedures have been established to facilitate the exchange of information and to protect the confidentiality of that information.

The Monitor established a schedule for periodic meetings with the individual parties and stakeholders and has established a monthly meeting in which they all participate. Specifically, that All Stakeholder meeting includes: APD, AFR, CSC, the Attorney General's Office, the City Manager's Office, the City Attorney's Office, the Community Advisory Council, the International Association of Fire Fighters (IAFF), the Fraternal Order of Police (FOP), the Police Auditor, and the Bureau of Justice Administration's Public Safety Program. During this meeting, the Monitor reports on significant developments during the preceding month, provides a preview of what is

⁶ The FOP is the collective bargaining agent for APD and the IAFF is the collective bargaining agent for AFR.

expected to be accomplished in the following month, and hears issues of concern or noteworthiness from each of those in attendance.

Following the establishment of the CAC, the Monitor held its first Town Hall Meeting during the first reporting period. This was a meeting which the public was encouraged to attend, where the Monitor sought and received public questions relative to the Consent Decree and the Monitor's role.⁷

During this reporting period the Monitor established its website at auroramonitor.org. The website is designed to provide information about the Consent Decree and the Monitorship as well as easy access to relevant documents including our periodic reports. It also provides a conduit for public comment and questions, as well as a link to resources and APD's Complaint Intake form.

Lastly, during this Reporting Period the monitor developed in collaboration with the City, its agencies and the Attorney General's Office, what the Monitor calls the "Methodologies to Aid in the Determination of Compliance" (MADCs) more fully described in more detail below. Pursuant to these methodologies, self-assessment questionnaires regarding the level of compliance and barriers to success with respect to certain mandates were distributed to and completed by the relevant City agencies.

CORE MONITORING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

As noted, there are two major tranches of work that the Monitor is called upon to perform. The first is the auditing of the performance of the City, APD, AFR and CSC in complying with the individual mandates of the Decree. The second is providing technical assistance to the Departments as requested. During this period, the Monitor Team began the audit function, reviewing 36 provisions of the Decree as enumerated below and summarized on the Report Card contained in Appendix A. The Monitor also provided technical assistance in the areas of Recruitment, Hiring and Promotion; Biased Policing; Stops; and Use of Force, as well as executing a baseline survey of community sentiment relative to APD and AFR.

METHODOLOGIES TO AID IN THE DETERMINATION OF COMPLIANCE

The MADCs were developed in full collaboration with the stakeholders. A notional draft of the document was circulated, commented on, refined, and ultimately agreed upon with the

⁷ The full meeting can be viewed at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7MZxPCuRaJ4&feature=youtu.be>

stakeholders. The purpose of the MADCs is to set forth the steps or tasks which will be expected of the relevant agency in achieving “substantial compliance” for each mandate of the Decree. In addition, the MADCs contain the data and information that the Monitor will be seeking from the City upon which, at least in part, determinations of level of compliance will be made. Lastly, the MADCs lay out when each mandate will be reviewed. Prior to each mandate being assessed, the Monitor will request the relevant City agency to self-assess where that agency believes it is in the process of compliance with that particular mandate and whether the agency believes itself to be in compliance. The full version of MADCs are attached as Appendix E.

REPORT CARD

The Report Card, attached as Exhibit A, is a graphic representation of the progress that the City is making toward full compliance with the Consent Decree. For each reporting period, those mandates that have been assessed by the Monitor will be assigned an icon representing the approximate level of compliance of that mandate and whether, in the Monitor’s view the progress is as expected (green), in danger of going off-track (yellow), or off-track (red).

SURVEY OF COMMUNITY SENTIMENT

In order to understand the sentiment of the community relative to its public safety agencies and the reform measures which the City has agreed to and undertaken, the Monitor will conduct periodic surveys and will include the results of those surveys in our public reports and on the auroramonitor.org website. Our first survey was conducted at the close of our first reporting period, from May 25, 2022 to May 28, 2022 and surveyed 1,164 residents from age 18 and older. Respondents were recruited via text messages randomly selected cell phone numbers. The click through rate of the text message was 4.22% and the completion rate was 64.5%. The margin of error for the overall sample is +/-2.87%. The results of the survey are contained in Appendix G.

FOCUS ISSUES

In our periodic public reports, we will focus on various timely issues which affect the Consent Decree. These are the first of those issues.

THE TERMINATION OF CHIEF VANESSA WILSON

On April 6, 2022, Vanessa Wilson was terminated from her position as the Aurora Chief of Police. Chief Wilson had served with the Department for 25 years, and had spent eight months, as Interim Chief. She was appointed as permanent Chief on August 3, 2020, serving for a total of approximately twenty-one months in the position. During her tenure, Chief Wilson focused on

building trust with the community. She established “A New Way,” which is a plan of action to restore the community’s trust through a new way of policing. She also made multiple high-profile disciplinary decisions and was a key proponent in agreeing to the terms of the Consent Decree.

The decision of who serves as Chief of Police for the City of Aurora is a matter which rests solely with the City Manager. While Chief Wilson cooperated in every way possible in the first weeks of the Monitorship, that cooperation has continued under the Acting Chief, and the Monitor has received assurances from the City, that the selection of both an Interim Chief and a permanent Chief will be made with all due deference to continued commitment to the Decree and to the reform process. Indeed, it is not unusual in Monitorships to have leadership within a department change during the term of the Monitorship, and often, it is the Monitor, that becomes the constant during the reform process.

The Monitor and his team will work with whomever is in the Chief’s seat to make certain that all is being done to bring the required reforms to the Department and to the people of Aurora.

SIGNIFICANT EFFORTS AT IMPROVING POLICE-COMMUNITY RELATIONS

During the tenure of Chief Wilson, Aurora Police Department prioritized restoring trust with the community. As noted above, these efforts involved establishing a community-based policing philosophy (“A New Way”) and the establishment of the Department’s first Community Relations Section. Community prioritization is captured in APD’s Vision Statement indicating that “APD will continually evolve into an innovating agency by building trust and legitimacy through equitable, transparent, and effective policing,” and in its Organizational Goals to “advance positive perception of the department within the community.” Additionally, the Chief’s Youth Advisory Team was established to provide APD with opportunities to connect with teens to share ideas, build trusting relationships, and collaborate on the initiatives that positively impact local youth.

Beyond these efforts, multiple mechanisms to imbue community voice within APD’s operations have been undertaken by the City. The Community Police Task Force was established in June 2020, to evaluate, discuss, and develop recommendations to improve effective and transparent communication between APD and the community. The Task Force had twelve members of the community, was led by the Community Relations Section Manager, and issued a report with recommendations in March 2021.⁸

⁸ The report can be found at:
https://cdn5-hosted.civiclive.com/UserFiles/Servers/Server_1881137/File/News%20Items/Community-Police-Task-Force-report.pdf

One of the initiatives to further establish relationships with the youth in Aurora happened during the first reporting period. Aurora Youth Night was conceived by APD and created in direct response to youth feedback relating to a lack of safe spaces to meet others and access resources. The event, which occurred on March 16, 2022, was conducted in partnership with 15 community partners, such as WeeCycle, Tri-County Health Department, Fieldhouse (which hosted the event), Aurora Partners for Thriving Youth, Cherry Creek Schools Foundation, Secor Cares, Shoot 360 Basketball, Airhouse Adventure Park, and the Salvation Army. The feedback from the community regarding the event was overwhelmingly positive with parents commenting on how well-organized the event was and the youth sharing they had been excited about the event for weeks. There were approximately 1,400 people in attendance, approximately 1000 youths and 400 adults. There were many free resources distributed, including 5 days' worth of food for 200 families, 50 COVID vaccines, 50 books, 10 library cards, 440 pairs of shoes, 500+ games/STEM toys, bicycles, tablets, 750 youth resource backpacks, and 13,000 diapers. Nineteen APD officers played basketball and volleyball and otherwise connected in a real way with those in attendance.

The Monitor has every reason to believe that these significant efforts at improving police-community relations will continue under future administrations of the Department and will be monitoring these efforts through direct observation and through our periodic surveys (see Survey of Community Sentiment, above).

SYSTEMS TO ENSURE BEST PRACTICE POLICING

There are various systems and processes that represent best practice in assuring the public that a police department is properly holding itself and its members accountable through the identification, analysis, remediation, and on-going monitoring of potential issues. The absence or failures of these accountability systems are frequently at the core of systemic problems in a department.

Essentially these systems are designed to ensure that the policies of the department as trained on by its members, are being properly executed in the field. The general philosophy surrounding the suite of systems is that performance issues should be identified and corrected as early as possible. This includes issues of constitutional policing, including search, stop, arrest, use of force, and biased policing; tactical issues which can affect officer and civilian safety; and issues of courtesy, respect, and professionalism.

The systems include:

- First-line Supervision and Field Training
- Early Intervention
- Internal Affairs and Civilian Complaint Investigation Process
- Disciplinary System

- Data Analysis
- Performance Evaluation
- Customer Service Feedback
- Audit and Inspection
- Post Incident or After-Action Review Process

In this and upcoming reports, we will be examining how well these systems are performing their functions, and where they may be implicated in shortcomings of the Department.

FIRST LINE SUPERVISION

Sergeants hold a unique position in a police department. They are the direct managers of line officers and are relied upon to ensure that the policies of the department are adhered to and that the vision and goals of agency leadership are practices in the field. Sergeants, along with Field Training Officers, continue the training of officers after they graduate from the Police Academy. They must hold officers accountable for their actions and the documentation of those actions, and at the same time must look after the safety and welfare of those under their supervision. Sergeants also play a key role in promoting the culture of a police department. In most departments they are also responsible for periodically evaluating the overall performance of officers whose work they oversee.

We will, in the coming months, be examining whether the selection and training of Sergeants and Field Training Officers comports with best practice, and whether they are themselves being subjected to appropriate oversight, supervision and accountability. We will also be providing technical assistance in the form of providing APD with certain tools which can be used for this purpose.

Presently, APD policy requires that sergeants must evaluate every use of force by those they supervise and must respond to the scene for every Tier 2 and 3 uses of force. In addition, there is a policy which is currently suspended regarding the review of body-worn camera video (BWCV) of those they supervise.⁹ The Monitor notes that In order to be meaningful, reviews of BWCVs must be documented and must include appropriate remediations which are called for by the review. It is imperative that reviews be conducted in an unbiased manner and that the review process is consistent from sergeant to sergeant.

⁹ The City is entering into a new contract with Axon to purchase its offered Accountability function. The contract has been approved by City Management and is awaiting City Council approval. The function should be rolled out within the next 90 days, at which point the required viewing of mandatory random reviews of BWCV will begin.

EARLY INTERVENTION

The use of early warning or early intervention systems dates to the late 1990's. The systems and the premises upon which they were built have not changed significantly since then. The systems allow departments to track certain indicators¹⁰ which when aggregated may cross an established threshold and therefore deem the officer to be "potentially at-risk." A designated supervisor is then tasked to investigate and determine whether the officer is actually at-risk and, if so, to suggest appropriate remediation.

While an important safety net which does have its place, in today's world this is not truly "early" intervention. Rather, because it relies on an aggregation of different events, and does not require investigation until there is some multitude of events that have already occurred, it is, in fact, late intervention.

The better, and more pro-active approach to identify and correct the behavior of potentially at-risk officers is to enhance first-line supervision (see preceding section) with appropriate systems and support. Enhanced supervision permits front-line supervisors and the department alike to track and, essentially, continuously monitor officer performance along multiple metrics. This methodology mandates that an officer's immediate supervisor be involved in efforts to identify and remediate concerning behaviors and through the requirement to document those supervisory reviews, allows upper-level management within the department to supervise its supervisors.

Enhanced supervision can and should be utilized to identify potential wellness issues and to identify positive behavior for use in awards and training. The Monitor will be providing technical assistance to the City with respect to the implementation of this type of enhanced supervision.

While APD currently has a fairly robust policy on Early Intervention, its execution through the Administrative Investigations Management (AIM) system¹¹ is not nearly as robust as it should be. A properly functioning system when working along with enhanced supervision, is what is needed to ensure that officers receive what they need to make them all that they can and must be.

¹⁰ These indicators can include, among others, stops, uses of force, civilian complaints, lawsuits, failure to appear, failure to qualify and negative performance evaluations.

¹¹ The Administrative Investigations Management system, AIM, was designed to provide agencies with a tool to collect, manage, track, analyze and report on a wide range of data including Internal Affairs, Use of Force, Pursuits, Accidents, Awards, Time/Attendance and other data related to employee professionalism, performance and productivity. The tool was fully rolled out in 2011.

INTERNAL AFFAIRS AND CIVILIAN COMPLAINT INVESTIGATION PROCESS

A police department must have an effective complaint intake and investigation protocol for disciplinary issues that arise either from an internal, external, or civilian complaint. The process should be transparent on its steps for employees and civilians alike and provide for periodic updates, and final conclusions to all those involved. The process should also have defined timeframes for the completion, and potential extensions, of both the investigative and disciplinary portions of the process, with notifications to participants of any delays.

Internal Affairs units simultaneously serve two communities—law enforcement and the general public—and are essential in building and maintaining mutual trust and respect between the two. Police departments are obligated to ensure that officers operate within the confines of the law and according to procedure, and Internal Affairs units are how, at least in part, departments ensure compliance. Ideally, these units receive and manage the investigation of all incoming complaints against any member of the police department. Doing so can help prevent the perception that certain complaints are discounted or rejected for purely subjective reasons.

It is important for a department to define in policy the process by which a complaint will be received, documented, investigated, and reviewed and the permissible timeframes for those steps to be taken. Only through the timely and transparent resolution of complaints can employees and civilians begin to have confidence in the system working correctly. The standards used to adjudicate allegations should be transparent and the investigative process should conform to a written policy that clearly describes each of its steps so that community and officer expectations are set appropriately. The system should guard vigorously against bias or favoritism in every way possible, at least requiring documentation with respect to non-investigation and non-charging decisions.

In Aurora, APD created the Automated Complaint and Commendation System in 2006 to manage and record all complaints, investigations, and compliments or commendations relating to both sworn and non-sworn members of the department. The department permits submission of complaints through the City's website, via telephone, by mail, or in person, with all complaints entered into the automated system. Once in the automated system, the complaint is forwarded to the Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB) Commanding Officer, who then reviews the case and, decides whether the complaint should be reviewed at the District or Bureau level or by IAB itself. If a determination is made that the allegation can be investigated at the District or Bureau level, the case is sent to the appropriate Commanding Officer for investigation. The District or Bureau Commanding Officer will then assign the case to an appropriate supervisor to commence and complete a preliminary investigation. If during the preliminary investigation the investigator believes the allegation should not be handled at the District or Bureau level because of the seriousness or criticality of the investigation, a request for investigation by the IAB will be completed and forwarded through the complaint management system to the subject member's Division Chief.

If IAB determines that an investigation is warranted¹², the bureau will seek authorization from APD's Chief of Police, as under existing rules, only the Chief of Police can order an IAB investigation. Once approval is received, IAB commences an investigation and, upon its completion, notifies the subject officer, the officer's Division Chief, and the officer's commanding officers that the case is available for review. Thereafter, the case will be reviewed by the Chief's Review Board.¹³ If the Chief's Review Board sustains the allegation, the disciplinary process is commenced.

It is of the utmost importance that the investigative process, leading to findings as to whether misconduct was committed, is deemed by both employees of the department and the public to be fair, transparent, and consistent in its determinations. Fairness requires that any member accused of misconduct receives due process in the determination of whether a transgression of policy has occurred.

DISCIPLINARY PROCESS

The disciplinary process serves many purposes. Its primary function is to address police misconduct by appropriately punishing those who commit misconduct after it has occurred. When operating properly, the disciplinary process also serves to change the behavior of officers before misconduct occurs by signaling organizational expectations both internally and externally, and responding appropriately to internal and civilian complaints, thereby enhancing trust in the department from both within its ranks and from the community at large. An ineffective process, on the other hand, can negatively affect both officer morale and community trust. Historically, problems with transparency and consistency in the disciplinary processes have persisted in police departments throughout the nation.

In Aurora, once the Chief's Review Board makes a recommendation of discipline to the Chief of Police, the Chief of Police decides whether to accept or modify the recommendation, and the subject sworn member is informed of the Chief's decision during a pre-disciplinary "hearing." During this hearing, the sworn member has the opportunity to provide any additional context or mitigating information that may help inform the Chief's decision. The sworn member may waive

¹² For certain critical incidents, including police-involved shootings or uses of force resulting in serious injury or death, an IAB investigation may result regardless of whether misconduct is alleged or indicated against any involved officer.

¹³ The Chief's Review Board is chaired by the Deputy Chief of Police and includes the subject member's Division Chief, Bureau/District Commanding Officer, IAB Commander, and a City HR representative. They review the entire case along with a "Letter of Defense", if such a letter is submitted by the subject member. The Chief's Review Board has the option to send a case back to IAB for additional investigation or accept, reject, or modify some, all, or none of the IAB Commander's recommended findings. For any sustained charges, the Board recommends discipline to the Chief of Police.

the pre-disciplinary hearing, but the Chief of Police can order the sworn member to participate. The pre-disciplinary hearing is an informal hearing in which the sworn member is not represented by counsel, nor does the sworn member have the opportunity to confront witnesses.

The sworn member may also request an Independent Review Board¹⁴ to review the proposed discipline, but the decision to convene an Independent Review Board is completely within the discretion of the Chief of Police. After the pre-disciplinary hearing or Independent Review Board (if conducted), the Chief issues a final disciplinary order that is served upon the sworn member. The sworn member can either accept the non-disciplinary performance related action (which is not appealable to the Civil Service Commission) or formal discipline. If the sworn member receives formal discipline, the sworn member can choose to exercise the right to appeal the final order to the Civil Service Commission. The Aurora Civil Service Commission then holds a de novo hearing, resolving factual and legal issues and determines whether to uphold the Chief's disciplinary order, either in whole or in part. During this appellate process the officer is represented by counsel and the proceedings are conducted in accordance with rules of evidence.

In upcoming months, we will be reviewing the disciplinary system in detail and working with the parties and stakeholders to determine whether some revision to the system is appropriate. Our review will look at both the operations of the disciplinary system and the degree of transparency surrounding its outcomes.

DATA ANALYSIS

Using data systems and technology is a necessity for law enforcement agencies in today's environment. To fulfill their mission of ensuring public safety, organizations must keep abreast of emerging technologies and tools for solving crimes, collecting evidence, and gathering information and intelligence.

However, data systems and information technology can and must be used not only to enhance public safety, but also to assist in promoting reform and in the transformation of organizational culture. Data relative to potential disparities in police actions such as stops and after-stop searches, as well as arrests and uses of force, lie at the heart of evaluating whether disparities are indicative of bias or exist for reasons which are otherwise explainable.

To make such determinations, reliable and extensive data must be collected and the ability to analyze and interpret the data must reside within an agency through a combination of software

¹⁴ The Independent Review Board, if convened, recommends discipline for violations of policy based on the circumstances of the violation. The Board is under the control of the Human Resources Department of the City and the Board's review takes place after the pre-disciplinary meeting with Chief of Police. The Chief of Police may call for Independent Review Board's participation as well as the subject officer.

systems and staffing skill. Aurora is currently going through an upgrade in its data systems including a migration to a new computer-aided dispatch (CAD) and a new record management system (RMS) with the goal of interoperability and communication between the two systems. Previous systems, which operated in silos, did not enable the department to efficiently and accurately analyze their own data to identify areas of risks and necessary improvements. A more integrated system will help overcome the deficiencies of the City's prior system and should lead to the improvements described.

This and other data will also assist in the identification of potentially at-risk officers through a properly functioning enhanced supervision and early intervention system and will be able to identify any relevant trends in areas of concern such as, does one district have a statistically significant higher rate of uses of force or stops than another.

Lastly, the data will hold the key to potential re-direction of police resources from sworn officers to civilian employees handling a variety of calls identified as not needing immediate sworn/armed response. This is already being done to a certain extent in Aurora in areas of mental health and car crashes but has the potential of being expanded into other areas of policing. This reduction of workload would allow for quicker response times and potentially more training in the areas for which armed response by sworn officers is required.

The Monitor is currently providing technical assistance in this area to ensure that the right data is being collected to permit appropriate examinations and analyses in order to best benefit the Department and the public.

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

A potentially vital tool in maintaining the professionalism of a police department is an effective system of evaluating employee performance. Performance evaluations allow supervisors to evaluate whether subordinates are performing the job they were hired and/or promoted to do; measure the quantity and quality of their work; provide rewards for exceptional work; coach employees to grow and develop; identify specific problems and implement corrections to improve deficiencies. Performance evaluations create an opportunity for supervisors to gain a deeper understanding of employees' attitudes and strengths. In return, this will allow employees to know exactly how they are performing and what they can do to improve their value to their peers, the department, and the community.

In Aurora, the immediate supervisor completes an annual evaluation for each of their assigned members. The rating supervisor will electronically sign the evaluation form before submitting the evaluation to the next member in the chain of command for approval. All annual evaluations must be completed no later than the anniversary of the member's rank. The employee is offered an opportunity to fully review the supervisor's evaluation and has an opportunity to appeal the

evaluation. Additionally, immediate supervisors are required to conduct a performance review with each member in their command. The review is documented as a PAE (Performance Appraisal Entry) in the AIM system.

Historically, performance evaluation systems in many departments have suffered from a lack of true consistent evaluation, with supervisors failing to critically evaluate officers they are supervising.

The Monitor has not yet reviewed the performance evaluation system in Aurora but will be assessing the system going forward.

CUSTOMER SERVICE FEEDBACK

While serving the community is clearly the mission of policing, few departments regularly and systematically seek direct input from those in community with whom the police come in contact. Some police departments have introduced customer service/customer satisfaction surveys to the community to solicit positive or negative feedback from those with whom they come in contact to ensure that the department is providing the service its community wants. These efforts are undertaken with the goal of improving customer service. Aurora currently has no system of surveying those with whom they come in contact.

AUDIT AND INSPECTION

Internal audits and inspections are critical to ensure continuous improvement within a police department. An audit is a formalized and structured examination of a process or program.¹⁵ An inspection is typically a less formalized and more cursory review. Ideally, the method, subject and conclusions of an audit or an inspection will be captured in a report with findings and recommendations for corrective action.

In Aurora, the audit function of the APD is an Internal Police Auditor (IPA) who has been in her position since 2020 after the City Manager proposed, and City Council approved, the position. Aurora's IPA is not an APD employee but rather, works for the City's Internal Audit and is dedicated solely to police-related engagements. Functionally, the IPA works directly with the City Manager and reports administratively to the Internal Audit Department manager. The IPA audits have focused on policies and practices in APD's operations that directly affect the community, are potential high liability activities, and areas that are of significant public concern. The IPA function was created in part, to increase department transparency and to regain and then

¹⁵ Some departments have an Audit Unit, some have Inspections Unit, and some have independent oversight from an outside entity which can either be from a different agency in government structure of the jurisdiction, or may be outsourced from the private sector.

maintain, public trust. Thus far, the IPA has conducted audits of the body-worn camera system and the K-9 unit with other important topics scheduled for the future. In speaking with the IPA and APD executives, the APD found the audits to be helpful in identifying areas of improvement and the IPA has noted continuous cooperation from APD personnel necessary to conduct the audits.

POST-INCIDENT REVIEW PROCESS

A post-incident review process, whereby critical incidents including all uses of force are examined and evaluated to identify deficiencies and, to ensure that any needed improvements are identified and reinforced within policy, training, and supervision. Such a review process must focus on identifying opportunities to foster improvement in individual officers and continuous system improvement. These types of reviews may also uncover violations of policy which could require discipline and/or a referral for criminal investigation.

Ideally, the process should examine all relevant facts to determine the propriety of every aspect of an officer's actions including whether the actions were appropriate under applicable policy, and to what extent if any, anything about the officers' actions could have been done better. Reviews which are conducted may have a particular focus but should look at all policies implicated in any encounter. These policies would include activation of body worn camera video, fourth amendment issues including stops, searches and seizures, and use of force; fourteenth amendment issues relative to potential biased policing; the tactics leading up to and during the event that affected the safety of the subject, the officers, and the public; and, lastly, the conduct of the officer from a point of view of courtesy, respect, and professionalism.

With respect to uses of force, each use of force must be examined individually to determine the propriety of each particular use of force within a given incident. The analysis must also examine the extent to which the situation reasonably necessitated the use of force and whether attempts at de-escalation and disengagement/containment were sufficient. The reviews themselves must be done in a way to foster self-criticism and rigorous and candid self-examination by departments and individual officers alike. It is in this way that organizations get better.

APD currently conducts a structured review of certain levels or "tiers" of uses of force during their Force Review Board (FRB). APD's policies categorize uses of force into four tiers, which determine how subsequent investigations are conducted.

A Tier 0 (zero) use of force is a statutory use of force that includes handcuffing with no resistance, pat downs, consensual searches, and pointing of a less lethal or firearm.

Tier 1 uses of force, including control techniques used to overcome physical resistance with no injury/minor injury, take down with no injury/minor injury, use of control weapon (i.e., baton) for leverage or control purposes, and restraining measures to assist AFR/EMS/Medical

personnel, are investigated by the involved officer's sergeant and reviewed by the lieutenant in Professional Standards Section.

Tier 2 uses of force, including the use of pepper spray, baton strikes, taser, hand strikes, kicks, punches, and any injury in Tier 1 requiring professional medical treatment, are initially investigated by the officer's sergeant but forwarded for review through chain of command, and ultimately to the Force Investigation Unit for investigation and presentation to the Force Review Board.

Tier 3 uses of force, including use of deadly weapon, use of deadly force, and use of potentially deadly force (regardless of injury), are not investigated by the officer's supervisor, but rather by the Investigations Bureau Commander, who is in charge of the investigation. A Tier 3 use of force may also require investigation by the multi-jurisdictional Critical Incident Response Team depending on the circumstances. The Force Investigation Unit conducts a parallel administrative investigation which is presented to the Force Review Board.

The FRB has gone through significant changes and continues to implement iterative changes to its processes. These changes include expanding the review of a use of force to comprehensively consider all circumstantial factors, including the officer's actions and tactics used leading up to, and aftermath of, force incidents, rather than examining only the application of force itself. Currently, the FRB's membership includes representatives from throughout APD, including the Legal and Training Bureaus, and during the review meeting, the FRB Chair prompts FRB members to provide their assessments in turn. The review includes a discussion of training opportunities for officers involved in specific incidents and highlights similar behaviors among other officers that may require adjustments to academy or in-service training.

The Monitor and various members of the Monitor Team have attended a number of Use of Force Review Board meetings. Despite the recently expanded scope of the FRB's review, it still currently focuses much of its review on questioning whether the use of force was lawful and within policy, with comparatively less discussion of the context surrounding the use of force or the tactics and strategies that could have been used so as to best evaluate the necessity, proportionality, and reasonableness of the use of force by officers.

The Monitor will continue to observe Force Review Board meetings and will be providing technical assistance relative to making the meetings as useful as they can be.

WHEN SYSTEMS ARE NOT OPERATING OPTIMALLY

The failure of some individual officers to follow policy is, unfortunately, inevitable. That being said, best-practice policies, training, and the systems of accountability we have detailed in this section are meant to reduce the number and consequences of such transgressions to the bare

minimum. Moreover, they are meant to assure the public and the members of the organization, not only that the department is doing all it can to minimize transgressions, but that when they do occur, they will be dealt with swiftly, fairly, transparently and with appropriate consequences for the transgressor. The importance of best-practice policies, training and mechanisms of accountability cannot be overstated.

To learn from the past and help instill a culture of continuous improvement, in this report and in future reports to come, we will highlight individual incidents where the practices of the Department and systems of accountability outlined above have operated—in some cases well, and in some cases missing the mark. We will, of course, pursuant to the Consent Decree, be monitoring these practices and systems over the next five years and will be working with the Department to improve the efficacy of each, in order to help assure the public and those within the Department, that transgressions are being reduced to the lowest level possible, and that when they do occur, that the systems in place ensure they are dealt with appropriately.

The following incident has been selected for focus in this report because it highlights many of the issues facing policing and the community and the critical role of best-practice policies, training, and accountability systems. It is an incident, which could easily have resulted in a tragic officer involved shooting. It involved miscommunication and misperception between the officer and the subject, it implicated potential implicit biases that need to be specifically recognized and addressed, and it highlights the importance of intense field supervision and field training, especially for new officers. Some systems worked better than others and ultimately the officer received required remediation. That being said, the incident and its investigation and review must be instructive for APD and its officers to be the best they can be, which is the goal of the City, the Department, its officers, and, of course, the community.

MAY 15, 2021 TRAFFIC STOP INCIDENT

On May 15, 2021, an APD officer, with approximately 18 months on the job, conducted a stop of a vehicle he indicated had almost struck him while the officer was conducting a separate, unrelated traffic stop. According to the official Case Summary which formed the basis of the assessment by the Force Review Board, “The driver was asked for his driver’s license, vehicle registration, and proof of insurance. The driver quickly reached in the front of the waistband of his sweatpants. With the quickness and manner that he reached for his waistband, the officer believed that the driver could be reaching for a weapon.”¹⁶ This prompted the officer to draw

¹⁶ The names of officers and civilians are removed from any report references and substituted with appropriate identifiers a method which will generally be utilized in this and future Monitor reports.

his firearm, acquire the driver as a target, and order him to put his hands on his own face, which he failed to do to the officer's satisfaction.

The officer excitedly called for backup, and when backup arrived "the driver opened the door and began walking towards the officer, who backed up still pointing his firearm at the driver and continued to give commands." While other responding officers drew their weapons, one of the responding officers ran up to him and took him down by tackling him to the ground. While on the ground, four officers and the driver struggled, with the original officer using his Taser to gain compliance by drive stunning¹⁷ the driver on two separate occasions. Eventually, the driver was handcuffed and restrained and evaluated by emergency medical personnel before being transported to a nearby hospital for further evaluation and treatment.

The driver was eventually released on five summonses, with charges including obstruction and interference, resisting arrest, failure to obey an order, failure to yield to an emergency vehicle, and possession of an open container of alcohol.¹⁸ The incident was reviewed by the Force Review Board in June of 2021.

During this review, the Board concluded that the initial officer made a legal traffic stop, activated his body-worn camera pursuant to departmental policy but "could have been more professional" and "more in control of himself." The Force Review Board's documentation of the review contained an analysis for "Handcuffing and De-escalation," which focused only on the conduct of officers after the driver had been taken down to the ground. This analysis noted that the driver was noncompliant, although this may have been in part due to the pain response from the Taser drive stun.

The Board's conclusions were sent to the District Commander in charge of the responding officers with a recommendation that the officer receive additional training relative to the failure to conduct a DUI investigation, and the use of the Taser which was found to be within policy but

¹⁷ A drive stun is performed by having the Taser in direct contact with the subject. While this is painful to the subject it does not interrupt muscular activity as would the firing of a taser with the two fired barbs hitting the subject. Because pain compliance naturally evokes a resistance response it is not recommended as a method to gain control of a subject or to engender compliance.

¹⁸ The driver, after being handcuffed, admitted that he had consumed marijuana that evening. No charges with respect to DUI were brought for impairment from either alcohol or marijuana. It is unclear if the information relative to the marijuana use was even conveyed to the initial arresting officer.

inadvisable under the circumstances¹⁹. Notwithstanding that only these items had been assigned for review, one of the supervisors designated to speak with the Officer, recognized that there were other issues that needed to be remediated and assigned the Officer for a training session in which he was spoken to about using a script for traffic stops, controlling his emotions, and remaining calm so as to help those with whom he is dealing remain calm²⁰. In addition, the officer and those additional officers who were involved in the handcuffing of the driver were sent for remedial training in controlling a subject on the ground and drive stunning with the Taser. The officer also received an “Unsatisfactory Performance” on a Performance Appraisal Entry in the AIM System, for the failure to conduct a proper DUI investigation.²¹

On September 24, 2021, portions of the BWCV were released to the media by the attorney for the driver.²² The BWCV showed the public that what began as traffic stop for failing to properly yield while the officer was engaged in another traffic stop, came extremely close to being an officer involved shooting which likely would have caused death or serious injury to the driver as well as potentially to the passenger in the vehicle and other officers who ultimately arrived on the scene. It showed that the officer began to escalate the encounter with a lecture to the driver, threatened to tow the driver’s vehicle when the driver offered an explanation in response to the lecture, that the driver at least partially complied with the officer’s request for his registration

¹⁹ The current APD policy on Taser usage is unclear on this point, although the point is apparently covered in Taser training.

²⁰ Although the Sergeant is to be commended for going beyond the recommendations of the FRB, the Performance Appraisal Entry (PAE), which forms the record of both disciplinary and non-disciplinary evaluations of performance, was “neutral” as opposed to “Unsatisfactory Performance”.

²¹ The FRB apparently failed to consider the officer’s involvement in a Tier 2 use of force which occurred approximately one month before the May 15 incident. That use of force, the striking of a burglary suspect with two less lethal bean bag rounds, leading to a finding of “Unsatisfactory Performance” with the notation that the officer “made a series of unsatisfactory decisions and tactics which ultimately led to the use of force.” Similarly, the FRB did not appear to consider that the officer, that in October 2020, was involved in a serious traffic crash while on duty and responding to an emergent call. The officer was found to be at fault and was given a written reprimand for that incident.

²² The BWCV was, of course, available and utilized in the investigation and review of the matter by FRB.

and was reaching into his pants, apparently to retrieve his license pursuant to the officer's request.²³

It is clear from all accounts that the officer misconstrued the attempt of the driver to produce his license and genuinely, but for reasons that are not exactly clear, felt threatened by the driver's actions. But the officer failed to take the tactical steps to first prevent the potential confusion by asking where the driver's license was located, and subsequent steps to reduce the likelihood of needing to employ deadly force and protecting himself.

The officer drew his firearm pointing it directly at the driver. The officer became extremely agitated using expletives to issue various orders including demanding that the driver and the female passenger in the vehicle put their hands on their faces, which they each did, although, in the case of the driver, intermittently and not to the officer's satisfaction.

The officer called for backup and when backup arrived, the driver, disregarding the officer's admonition to remain in the vehicle, exited the vehicle and was immediately taken down by one of the responding officers, while the initial officer still had his firearm trained on the driver, and other arriving officers had their firearms drawn. While on the ground the driver was tased by the original officer twice, both in drive stun mode. Immediately after the takedown and during the time on the ground while being handcuffed, the driver is heard repeatedly saying that all he wanted to do was to comply with the officer's command to give him his license and registration. The officer responds by saying, "You just about got shot."

Following the release of BWCV by the driver's attorney, and press interest in the matter, the case was referred by Chief Wilson to Internal Affairs for an additional investigation.²⁴

Following the ordering of the IAB investigation, but before the investigation was undertaken, the officer was placed on restricted duty and was detailed to the Training Academy for sixteen days in October 2021 where he received extensive re-training in accordance with a performance improvement plan. The officer, who acknowledged all of the mistakes which he made, was then

²³ It appears that the driver was reaching into his pants for his license based on the fact that no weapon or contraband was removed from the driver at any time, and the driver makes numerous references during the encounter that he was only trying to comply with the officer's request.

²⁴ The Chief also requested that the Douglas County Sheriff's Office review the case for any potential criminality and the appropriateness of the use of force. The DCSO provided such a review and found that no criminal charges were appropriate and that the use of force was appropriate under the circumstances. The way in which the situation could have been avoided was not dealt with in the DCSO findings.

placed on a daytime patrol assignment, presumably for more intense supervision, for approximately three weeks.

The internal affairs review was extensive and uncovered a second, though relatively minor, use of force at the hospital, when officers had to assist hospital personnel in transitioning to soft restraints. The IAB investigation probed and clearly established that the stop, if done differently, would have likely yielded a much different outcome. The involved officer, recognized this, accepted responsibility for his actions, and vowed to do better going forward.

In speaking with members of the executive staff of APD about this case, all acknowledged that the officer's reactions were out of proportion to the situation and that his state of mind and actions contributed to the escalation of the event. It was also mentioned that new recruits who came into the Department during COVID, had not received as much supervisory oversight as previous recruits because of staffing shortages. Lastly, it was mentioned that because of the bidding system that APD uses, new recruits are assigned to high crime hours (graveyard shifts), with new supervisors and new FTOs who also are at the lowest level of the bidding hierarchy for their supervisory positions.

This incident demonstrates the need for not only in-depth investigations, but investigations and reviews which are done with an extremely critical eye, in order to make both the Department and individual APD officers better, and better protect officers and the public alike. According to its records, the FRB failed to examine the officer's history which would have indicated a significant incident only a month earlier and an involvement in an on-duty traffic collision. The Board also did not appear to consider the use of force utilized when a responding officer tackled the driver while the initial officer still had his weapon trained on the driver and other officers, positionally opposite from the initial officer, had their weapons drawn. This placed the tackling officer at grave risk had the initial officer decided to employ deadly force at that moment. Moreover, the fact that this situation unnecessarily evolved into one that came perilously close to an officer involved shooting did not consume the Board. Simply put, the Board's review should have been much more critical, in the nature of a deep-diving after-action report, with every aspect of how that which occurred could have been avoided and probed for lessons which could be taught both to the involved officer and to the Department at large.

It is also imperative that whenever any review of an incident is undertaken that all aspects of that incident should be examined in its totality. (See section *"How the Systems Should Work"*, below). Ideally, these kinds of issues are first caught and remediated in a non-disciplinary way through routine random and targeted supervisory reviews of BWCV. Moreover, when issues do occur and are remediated, the remediation should be monitored through enhanced supervision for a period of time through BWCV with a documentation by supervisors of the review and assessment

of each video reviewed. Lastly, the field training and supervision of new officers also needs to be examined, as the pairing of inexperienced officers with inexperienced supervisors and inexperienced field trainers during high crime hours does not best protect officers or the public. In short, there are valuable lessons to be learned from this encounter and its investigation and review. The Monitor will begin working with the FRB during the next Reporting Period, and will, of course, continue to examine these issues going forward.

HOW THE SYSTEMS SHOULD WORK

When accountability systems in place are operating optimally in an incident under review, the investigation and review should seek answers (and come to appropriate conclusions) in each of the following areas:

- Whether BWC's were properly activated during the incident;
- Whether the stop or detention of the involved individual was lawful and comported with policy;
- Whether the mental status of the individual contacted was ascertainable and whether it factored into the decision-making process of the officer appropriately;
- Whether each use of force²⁵ utilized in gaining control and compliance was lawful and comported with policy;
- Whether the use of force occurred after reasonable attempts to nonviolently avoid the use of force through potential de-escalation or containment of the situation;
- Whether any searches or seizures were conducted and if so, whether they were performed lawfully and within policy;
- Whether the incident itself presented any implication of biased policing;
- Whether the tactics that were utilized during the encounter best protected the subject, the public and the involved officers (includes information sharing, pre-event planning, and incident management);
- Whether any officers on the scene should have intervened to prevent excessive use of force;
- Whether officers comported themselves in the courteous, respectful and professional manner expected of them under the circumstances,

²⁵ Use of Force in this context would include the acquiring of an individual as a target or pointing of a firearm at an individual.

- Whether the post-stop actions of officers, including the rendering of medical assistance, and relieving involved officers of continued involvement at the first opportunity were optimal, lawful and comported with policy;
- Whether all reports and statements regarding the incident were complete and truthful;
- Whether inter-agency cooperation with AFR comported with policy;
- Whether any policies other than those directly implicated in the review were violated in the interaction;
- Whether there are lessons to be learned from the incident that potentially provide instruction for improvement of existing policies or training;
- Whether the incident, even if found to be within policy and applicable law, could have been handled differently with an improved outcome, and how that could have been accomplished;²⁶ and,
- The history of the officer involved to determine to what extent, if at all, that history may help fashion the most appropriate remediation.

To the extent that deficiencies are found to exist in any of these areas, a decision of whether to treat those failures as requiring retraining or discipline must be answered. The answer to this question must lie in the severity of the deficiency and the history of the officer. Even in a case where it appears that a disciplinary action should occur, appropriate non-disciplinary remediation should be undertaken.

In the case of the May 15 traffic incident, the investigation and the Force Review Board review did use a checklist with many of the above questions answered. The Board did recognize that there was a need for some remediation. It was ultimately, a re-review of the incident, that caused the intense remediation which was undertaken. Yet, the question of what caused the situation to unnecessarily escalate and what training (or policy) might have prevented that from happening, was never confronted head on, nor was the issue of what role implicit bias may have played in the encounter. As noted, the Monitor will be working with the Department to further refine the Force Review Board process.

²⁶ This portion of an investigation and review goes specifically to a mandate of the Consent Decree, requiring training to be developed in “deliberate decision making, including unnecessary escalation and teaching officers what they *should* do rather than what they *can* do.”

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATES THIS REPORTING PERIOD

In each Reporting Period, the Monitor will assess various Mandates of the Consent Decree as disaggregated, or distilled, from the Consent Decree itself. During this first Reporting Period, the Monitor assessed 36 of the 70 Mandates contained in the Consent Decree. Of the 36 Mandates assessed, nine were found to be substantially in compliance or “complete” at this time, with the remaining 27 Mandates at various stages of compliance. The current status of each Mandate is depicted as an icon which shows the degree of completion that the Monitor assesses that particular Mandate has achieved, and, through the coloring of the icon, whether the City or its constituent agency is on the right track (green), a cautionary track (yellow), or the wrong track (red). The legend for our findings appears below:

LEGEND	ESTIMATED 0-24% COMPLETE	ESTIMATED 25-49% COMPLETE	ESTIMATED 50-74% COMPLETE	ESTIMATED 75-99% COMPLETE	SUBSTANTIAL COMPLIANCE
RIGHT TRACK (IN LINE WITH MONITOR EXPECTATIONS)					
CAUTIONARY TRACK (AT THIS TIME UNCERTAIN IF MONITOR'S EXPECTATIONS WILL BE MET)					
WRONG TRACK OR UNACCEPTABLY OVERDUE (EXPECTATIONS OF MONITOR ARE NOT BEING MET)					
NOT EVALUATED IN THE INDICATED REPORTING PERIOD	[CELL IN CURRENT OR PAST REPORTING PERIODS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]				
TO BE EVALUATED IN THE NEXT REPORTING PERIOD					

The remainder of this report contains a description of each Mandate assessed in RP1, organized by the six sections of the Consent Decree as follows:

- Policies and Training Generally: An analysis of 2 of 5 Mandates
- Racial Bias in Policing: An analysis of 1 of 11 Mandates
- Use of Force: An analysis of 9 of 17 Mandates
- Stops: An analysis of 4 of 7 Mandates
- Chemical Sedatives: An analysis of 9 of 9 Mandates
- Recruitment: An analysis of 11 of 17 Mandates
- Transparency: An analysis of 0 of 2 Mandates

For each Mandate assessed, we included a general description of the tasks, the actual text from the Consent Decree, a brief description of the MADCs, along with the Monitor's assessment of compliance during the current Reporting Period.

POLICIES AND TRAINING GENERALLY

INTRODUCTION

Police policies are rules and standards by which agencies operate, the guidebook that helps officers navigate the challenging and dynamic scenarios they face every day. These policies are the key foundation for an effective department, and they also serve as a promise to the community that officers will respond safely and responsibly. Effective policies and procedures should be a part of defining an agency's culture and providing a roadmap for all officers. Trainings will reinforce the policies and procedures to provide officers with support in understanding federal, state, and local standards and agency requirements. Appropriate training will facilitate the operation of police agencies in accord with strategic policies that guide their conduct, as well as attempt to best ensure that individual officers become competent and confident in performing their role in concert with operational and tactical policies.

The Consent Decree mandates for APD and AFR to continuously work to ensure policies are consistent and complementary and conduct training to ensure coordinated responses and hold officers and firefighters accountable for violating policy.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the status of two of the five Mandates in this area of the Consent Decree. Overall, the Monitor discovered a significant lack of proper and adequate governance structure in APD to develop and finalize policies. Professional Standards Section (PSS) in APD is tasked with developing and finalizing policies, but it appears that policy or procedures are often set through informal emails, and that the workflow that a proposed policy must take in order to be enacted is not standardized. The City has begun to address this issue by contracting with Crime and Justice Institute (CJI) to improve its policy development protocols, which will begin in RP 2.

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 1

Current Status:  - (0-24% Complete. It is uncertain if the expectations of the Monitor will be met.)

Mandate 1 at II (page 4) of the Consent Decree, entitled "Policies and Training Generally" requires that the Monitor determine if the APD and AFR are developing comprehensive policies to ensure

the implementation of the Consent Decree and that the policies of each department are consistent and complementary. The Monitor will also determine if the training is being conducted to ensure coordinated responses, and that officers and firefighters are being held accountable for violation of policy

The text of Mandate reads as follows:

“Aurora Fire Rescue and Aurora Police agree to develop comprehensive policies and procedures that ensure implementation of this Consent Decree. In addition, Aurora Fire Rescue and Aurora Police will work to ensure policies are consistent and complementary, conduct training to ensure coordinated responses, and hold officers and firefighters accountable for violating policy.”

The compliance definition as agreed to in the MADC, necessitates that APD achieve compliance with all 32 different policy driven Mandates and 16 different training driven Mandates (11 and two respectively for AFR). Said simply, APD and AFR must develop and implement all Consent Decree required policies and training and, must also have an adequate policy conformance accountability process in place to achieve full compliance with Mandate 1.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the status of this Mandate relative to APD. We have not yet formally examined AFR with respect to this Mandate, but intend to do so in the next reporting period. The Monitor discovered a significant lack of proper and adequate governance structure to develop and finalize policies. As an example, the Monitoring Team worked closely with the legal team of APD, along with a representative of PSS in developing the Documentation of Contacts policy, yet others within the Professional Standards Section were in the process of developing a different policy without any coordination with the ongoing efforts of the APD legal team and Monitor. The Monitor has discussed this issue with the City. The City has recognized the problem and is going to work with the Crime and Justice Institute in formalizing and streamlining policy development with proper protocols to guide the workflow to ensure efficient and effective policy development. Without such structure, the messaging to the officers can be inconsistent and confounding, thereby being counterproductive to the work and efforts invested into developing effective policies.

Similarly, with respect to training, at least one instance of ad hoc training from an individual officer in one District, was being delivered to officers in the Department without a review or sign off by appropriate units within the Department. Although we understand and commend the impulse to develop and provide such training, and understand that in this instance, the training was well-done and consistent with existing policy, it is imperative that any such training be properly vetted before delivery to ensure such consistency.

We commend the City for self-reporting this deficiency and its nascent efforts to address it. We will be closely coordinating with CJI relative to this Mandate.

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 3

Current Status:  - (0-24% Complete. It is uncertain if the expectations of the Monitor will be met.)

Mandate 3 at IIA (page 4) of the Consent Decree, entitled “Submission of new policies for review” requires that the Monitor determine if all new or revised policies, procedures and rules called for by the Consent Decree have been submitted to the CD Monitor for review before implementation.

The text of Mandate reads as follows:

“During the time covered by the Consent Decree, Aurora will submit any new or revised policies, procedures, or rules outlined in this Consent Decree to the Consent Decree Monitor for review before implementation until a time when the Consent Decree Monitor decides that such review is no longer necessary.”

The compliance definition as agreed to in the MADDC, necessitates that APD achieve compliance with all 32 different policy driven Mandates (11 for AFR and eight for CSC). APD, AFR, and CSC must develop and implement all of the Consent Decree required policies in coordination with the Monitor to achieve full compliance with Mandate 3.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the status of this Mandate with respect to APD. The Monitor did not formally assess this Mandate with respect to AFR but intend to do so in the next reporting period. The Monitor discovered that this Mandate needs to be reinforced and itself made part of policy and the workflow of policy amendment or development. During the Reporting Period there were some arguably relevant policies that were developed and finalized without the consultation of the Monitor. The Monitor ultimately reviewed the policies and had no issues with the revisions.

ADDRESSING RACIAL BIAS IN POLICING

INTRODUCTION

Despite federal and state laws prohibiting racially biased policing, and internal departmental policies that articulate commitments against bias-based practices, policing across the nation has struggled to consistently administer policing in ways that fully address racial bias in policing. The

extent to which racial disparities exist, and whether they are derivative from racial bias, either implicit or explicit, continues to be a significant issue and a barrier to full community trust. Racial justice movements have pressed to keep the issue of racial bias at the forefront of policing issues, and virtually all policing reform measures are evaluated, at least in part, on how they improve policing along racial bias metrics. To improve both perception and performance, APD and the City of Aurora must build upon their considerable bias-reduction efforts. Importantly, they must ensure that departmental policies and training programs are attentive to bias and disparity and are geared toward heightening conscious awareness of those issues. Doing so will help ensure that the department continues to mitigate disparities while signaling to the Aurora community that bias and disparity minimization remain priorities, which will, in turn, improve community trust.

HISTORY AND BASIS FOR CONSENT DECREE MANDATES

Section 08.32 of APD's Directives Manual, adopted on October 7, 2020, defines biased based policing as "an enforcement action based on a trait common to a group, without actionable intelligence to support consideration of that trait." The directive prohibits APD officers from engaging in biased-based policing predicated on race, ethnicity, gender, national origin, language, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, age, and disability. The directive further contains provisions relating to traffic stops; the establishment of a citizen comment line; the responsibilities of commanding officers upon their receipt of a complaint of prohibited bias; complaint tracking; and officer training. The directive, while reaffirming APD's departmental stance against bias-based policing, has been criticized as being insufficiently detailed to curb officer conduct that could tend toward discriminatory policing.

In its September 15, 2021, report, the Colorado Attorney General found that, notwithstanding the APD policy, both statistical and anecdotal data supported its conclusion that APD has engaged in a pattern and practice of race-based policing. After analyzing departmental data on race and use of force, for example, the Attorney General found that APD officers used force, arrested, and filed discretionary charges against Black and non-White people at a significantly higher rate than they did against White people, and that a greater percentage of Black and non-White communities experienced those actions than did members of White communities. The report also cited the anecdotal experiences of community members and Attorney General investigators who commented on differences in how APD officers interacted with members of different racial groups, including frequent escalations of force against non-White residents compared to White residents.

The Attorney General’s September 15 report included an admonishment that, to “remedy and eliminate its practice of race-based policing, Aurora must make major changes across the organization to improve its culture, including improving its policies, training, recordkeeping, and hiring.” The Attorney General’s report specifically called for greater detail in APD policies against racially biased policing; more specific standards and expectations for APD officers when they make a stop or arrest or use force; better tracking of outcomes for people arrested on misdemeanor charges to identify discrepancies between arrest rates and prosecution rates; and improved training for police academy cadets and in-service officers, among other recommendations.

CONSENT DECREE’S OBJECTIVES

The Consent Decree seeks to change, in measurable ways, how APD engages with all members of the community, including by reducing any racial disparities in arrests, uses of force, and engagement with the community, and to improve APD’s transparency in these areas.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Policies must be created and improved to give officers concrete guidance on how best to engage in critical decision-making and exercise discretion during community interactions. Through its policies, APD must acknowledge the role that bias can play in enforcement decisions, including in stops, arrest, and uses of force, and memorialize strategies to combat bias by the Documentation of Contacts Policy Adoption Deadline (by May 16, 2022), Stops Policy Deadline (by June 15, 2022), and Use of Force Policy Deadline (by November 12, 2022). Policies must prohibit discrimination based on protected class status and conform to the goals of the Consent Decree and applicable state and federal law, including by making policies more detailed and providing examples of prohibited behavior. Simply put, protected class status, cannot be the basis, in whole or in part, of any police action except when part of a suspect description.

TRAINING IMPLICATIONS

For officers to know how best to engage in critical decision-making and how to exercise discretion properly during community interactions, APD must develop trainings on bias, deliberate decision-making, recordkeeping requirements, and how to specifically articulate the basis for encounters. This training must acknowledge the role that bias can play in enforcement decisions, including in stops, arrest, and uses of force, and must instruct officers on strategies to combat bias by the Stops Policy Training Deadline (by August 14, 2022), Bias Training Deadline (by February 15, 2023), and Use of Force Training Development Deadline (by February 15, 2023).

OPERATIONAL INTEGRITY IMPLICATIONS

After the newly developed policies are implemented and the training is completed, the Monitoring Team will evaluate for operational integrity, that is, whether the policies and trainings are being followed in practice. Prior to full post-implementation monitoring, the Monitoring Team will establish a baseline by understanding how biased policing is captured and reviewed.

DATA UTILIZATION

APD, working with the Monitoring Team will need to determine which data does and does not exist. The Team's subject matter expert will identify, with APD, the metrics that will be used to measure improvements relative to policies and training developed in accordance with the mandates in this section.

PROGRESS AND NOTABLE OBSERVATIONS FROM THIS REPORTING PERIOD

Initial progress on achieving the requirements of the Consent Decree's mandates on addressing racial bias in policing has been promising. The City of Aurora worked with the Monitoring Team to finalize Contacts Forms to start collecting data that will be used to inform APD's policies and training on racial bias and disparity and to improve the department's culture overall. The City also worked with the Monitoring Team to finalize its Documentation of Contacts Policy and started working with the Team's subject matter expert to improve the City's recordkeeping and data collection and analysis to better measure how APD engages with the Aurora community.

The City and the Monitoring team also began to establish baselines of what data is currently being collected, what data systems are currently in use, how these systems link together, how data is analyzed, how data analysis is shared to drive strategies forward, and how racial and ethnic disparities are measured and tracked. Points of focus included data on use of force, contacts, pedestrian and vehicular stops, calls for service, crime incidents, gun recoveries, and early warning/intervention systems for APD personnel. The City is in the process of updating and migrating their computer-aided dispatch (CAD) and record management (RMS) systems and has plans to migrate APD's use of force and early-intervention program data to a new system. The goal is for these systems to be capable of communicating with one another and to improve the City's ability to analyze the data stored within.

The Monitoring Team reviewed Section 08.32 of APD's Directives Manual on bias-based policing and other policies relating to the department's investigative process, including those pertaining to contacts, field interviews, reasonable suspicion, and responding to calls alleging suspicious behaviors. This review revealed that APD lacks a policy dedicated to the conduct of pedestrian

and vehicular stops and the legally permissible bases for such stops. However, APD has begun to improve its policies and is drafting new policies dedicated to constitutional policing during stops and investigative encounters.

The Monitoring team also reviewed the department's in-service and academy training curricula. The in-service training curricula reviewed included those relating to courses on changing perspective; new perspectives on community policing; Ethics: Trust and Integrity; and de-escalation. The academy curricula reviewed included those relating to courses on law enforcement ethics and anti-bias policing; bias-motivated hate crimes; implicit bias; cultural awareness; and patrol observation and perception.

THIS REPORTING PERIOD'S ASSESSMENTS OF INDIVIDUAL MANDATES IN THE SECTION

During this Reporting Period the Monitor assessed one of the 11 Mandates in this section as follows:

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 8

Current Status:  - (0-24% Complete. In line with Monitor expectations.)

Mandate 8 at III A (page 7) of the Consent Decree, entitled "Addressing Racial Bias in Policing – Objectives - Policies and Training," requires that the Monitor determine if APD has improved its policies and training on officer stops, arrests, and uses of force such that officers receive concrete guidance on how best to make critical decisions and exercise discretion while interacting with members of the community. The Monitor must also determine if APD's policies and training adequately acknowledge the role that bias can play in enforcement decisions by officers and whether APD has developed strategies for combatting bias.

The text of Mandate reads as follows:

"The City shall improve Aurora Police policies and training relevant to officer stops, arrests, and uses of force to give officers concrete guidance on how best to engage in critical decision-making and exercise discretion during community interactions, including by acknowledging the role that bias can play in enforcement decisions and developing strategies to combat bias."

The compliance definition as agreed to in the MADC, necessitates that the APD's policy and training on this topic, be developed, approved by the Monitor, disseminated, trained on, and being implemented to achieve full compliance with Mandate 3.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the status of this Mandate. The Monitor found that APD has worked with the Monitoring Team's subject matter expert to develop a Contacts Form, which was beta tested before being finalized and will be implemented in RP2, and the Documentation of Contacts Policy. The Monitor further found that APD worked to improve its data collection relevant to the Consent Decree's mandates on bias and racial disparity in developing the Contacts Form, including determining the metrics that will be used to measure improvements in how APD engages with the community. The City and the Monitoring team also began to establish baselines of what data is currently being collected, what data systems are currently in use, how these systems link together, how data is analyzed, how data analysis is shared to drive strategies forward, and how racial and ethnic disparities are measured and tracked. Points of focus included data on use of force, contacts, pedestrian, and vehicular stops, calls for service, crime incidents, gun recoveries, and early warning/intervention systems for APD personnel. The City is in the process of updating and migrating their computer-aided dispatch (CAD) and record management (RMS) systems and has plans to migrate APD's use of force and early-intervention program data to a new system. The goal is for these systems to be capable of communicating with one another and to improve the City's ability to analyze the data stored within. While the work on this Mandate has not yet begun, the addressing of data needs puts the Department on the right track with respect to this Mandate.

USE OF FORCE

INTRODUCTION

Unnecessary and excessive uses of force—and uses of force that are perceived to be unnecessary or excessive by community observers—comprise perhaps the single greatest source of police-involved controversies. High-profile use of force incidents have occurred in every decade since American policing was formally professionalized in the early 20th century. These incidents have stirred protest, condemnation, and reflection within aggrieved communities and the ranks of sworn members of service alike.

Police departments have often defended their use of force practices as conforming to all constitutional minimum standards, including the requirements that all uses of force be proportionate to any threat faced by officers. However, departments face increasing pressure to enact policies and protocols that would reserve uses of force as secondary measures of resort even when force would otherwise be legally permissible.

The conversations surrounding uses of force and the controversies they have instigated has prompted a revisitation of the use of force policies of virtually every police department. An ideal

set of policies would minimize unnecessary uses of force while maximizing the safety of police officers, those with whom they interact, and bystanders who may be caught in between. However, the development of such policies would, alone, be insufficient. Police departments must also commit to a robust and recurring training regimen that equips officers with specific skills, honed through scenario-based instruction, that allow them to achieve the goals of departmental policies in real world practice. Implementing these changes remains a primary objective for any modern department.

HISTORY AND BASIS FOR CONSENT DECREE MANDATES

APD's Directive Manual contains sections that articulate the APD's policies on the use of physical and deadly force; the use of less lethal devices, weapons, and techniques; the authorized use of a firearm; and an officer's duty to intervene when they witness conduct by another officer that violates applicable use of force requirements, among other force-related policies. Despite APD's collective use of force policies, significant deficiencies were identified in reviews conducted by the Colorado Attorney General's Office.

In its September 15 report, the Attorney General's Office found that APD had a pattern and practice of using force excessively. The report critiqued what it characterized as the APD's practice of using force whenever force could be legally justified—even if only under the outer limits of available legal justifications—rather than limiting the use of force for when force is necessary. It further found that force was disproportionately used against persons experiencing mental health crises and against persons of color, with force frequently justified as a response to a person's failure to obey a lawful order. The Attorney General's report faulted APD's policies and culture for encouraging officers to defaulting to the use of the maximally permitted level of force rather than non-force alternatives for gaining compliance from uncooperative subjects. The report noted that inadequate documentation by officers' of uses of force inhibited efforts to fully evaluate APD's use of force practices, but that available data and evidence suggested troubling trends. To remedy the adverse findings in the Attorney General's report, the Consent Decree prescribes specific mandates, including a revision of existing force-related policies, the creation of new policies pertaining to coordination between APD and AFR, modifications to the Force Review Board, and implementation of new training courses.

CONSENT DECREE'S OBJECTIVES

The Consent Decree seeks to create a culture of continuous improvement within the APD that prioritizes de-escalation, when possible, in accordance with Colorado law and that does not compromise officer safety when force must be used. It further seeks to create a culture of

collaboration between APD and AFR that is coordinated and that emphasizes public safety, and the development of accountability measures that consistently identify excessive uses of force, situations where force should not have been used even if it was legal, and recurring training and tactical issues related to use of force.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Policies must be developed to better equip officers to handle challenging situations in ways that reduce the use of force, ensure force is used in compliance with state and federal law, protect officer and community safety, and that build a culture of continuous improvement by the Use of Force Policy Deadline (by November 12, 2022) and Use of Force Policy Adoption Deadline (by December 12, 2022).

TRAINING IMPLICATIONS

Training must be developed to better equip officers to handle challenging situations in ways that reduce the use of force, ensure force is used in compliance with state and federal law, protect officer and community safety, and that build a culture of continuous improvement with scenario-based instruction on de-escalation and joint police and fire on-scene coordination trainings by the Use of Force Training Development Deadline (by February 15, 2023) and Use of Force Training Completion Deadline (by August 9, 2023).

OPERATIONAL INTEGRITY IMPLICATIONS

After the newly developed policies are implemented and the training is completed, the Monitoring Team will evaluate for operational integrity. Prior to full post-implementation monitoring, the Monitoring Team will establish a baseline by understanding how uses of force are captured and reviewed.

DATA UTILIZATION

Working with APD, the Monitoring Team will need to determine which data does and does not exist. To establish a baseline prior to the implementation of policies and completion of training, the Team will sample body-worn camera footage and participate in “ride-alongs” with APD officers, as well as observing Force Review Board Meetings. Upon the completed implementation of policies and training, the Team will sample body-worn camera footage, review associated documentation of uses of force, participate in ride-alongs, and continue its review of Force Review Board meetings. The Team will also review complaints from the public and associated documentation to ensure compliance with the implemented policies and training.

PROGRESS AND NOTABLE OBSERVATIONS FROM THIS REPORTING PERIOD

The Monitoring Team focused its efforts on reviewing relevant APD policies and protocols relating to use of force and the department's force review process. The goal of these initial efforts was to understand the department's current status on use of force issues and to establish baselines for evaluating future performance.

Among the items reviewed were APD's force-related policies, including Directives Manual sections 5.03 ("Use of Force"), 5.04 ("Investigating Use of Force"), and 9.06 ("Coordination with Aurora Fire Rescue and Emergency Medical Services"), and the forms used by APD supervisors to document uses of force. The Monitoring Team also reviewed the policies of the APD's Internal Affairs Bureau, including Directives Manual sections 10.02 ("Complaint and Discipline Procedures for Sworn Members ("Complaint and Discipline Procedures for Non-Sworn Members"), 10.04 ("Access to Internal Affairs Files"), 10.05 ("Rights of Members Under Administrative Investigation"), 10.08 ("Grievance Procedure"), 10.09 ("Discrimination, Harassment, and Sexual Harassment Complaint Procedures"), 10.10 ("Criminal Investigations Involving Members"), 10.12 ("Mediation"), and 10.13 ("Indemnification Investigation"). The Team also reviewed the Internal Affairs Bureau's standard operating procedures.

The Monitoring Team also reviewed the policies and processes of the Force Review Board, including attending multiple meetings of the Board. The Team notes that the Board has undergone significant changes since the enactment of Colorado Senate Bill 20-217 (SB20-217) in 2020, which imposed new use of force reporting requirements on local and state police agencies. Among these changes are a broadening and formalizing of the Board's review process, which originally focused primarily on uses of force themselves, with relatively little consideration of the circumstances before or after the force was applied. Added to the Board's review process is an assessment of a multitude of factors, including the lawfulness of an officer's presence on-scene; information gathering by responding officers; officer decision-making, communication, and de-escalation; medical responses and interventions; officer relief protocols; policy and training reviews; equipment assessments; and incident management.

The Team further reviewed the APD's training curricula on use of force, including its academy-based instruction on arrest control techniques, baton usage, chemical agents, crowd management, scenario-based use of force drills, edged weapons, excited delirium and in-custody deaths, firearms, launchable impact munitions, precision immobilization techniques, rolling road blocks, self-defense, stop sticks, tasers, and the WRAP restraint system. Additionally, the Team reviewed the in-service training curriculum on SB20-217 and the department's shotgun training. Finally, the team reviewed the training jointly administered by APD and AFR on officer rescue, ASHER, and RED, as well as APD's K9 basic training manual and K9 Unit audit materials. Lastly,

force-related materials developed by the Crime and Justice Institute on behalf of the City of Aurora, were reviewed and detailed discussions with CJI held on various aspects of Use of Force policy, training and operational integrity.

THIS REPORTING PERIOD'S ASSESSMENTS OF INDIVIDUAL MANDATES IN THE SECTION

During this Reporting Period the Monitor assessed nine of the 17 Mandates in this section as follows:

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 19

Current Status:  - (0-24% Complete. It is uncertain if the expectations of the Monitor will be met.)

Mandate 19 at IV A (Page 11) of the Consent Decree, entitled "Use of Force – Objectives – Accountability Measures," requires that the Monitor determine if the APD has improved and/or developed accountability measures that consistently identify excessive uses of force, situations where force should not have been used even if it was legal, and recurring training and tactical issues related to use of force.

The text of Mandate reads as follows:

"The City shall improve and develop accountability measures that consistently identify excessive uses of force, situations where force should not have been used even if it was legal, and recurring training and tactical issues related to use of force."

The compliance definition as agreed to in the MADC, necessitates that the APD achieve substantial compliance with Mandates 12-15, 32 and 36 to achieve full compliance with Mandate 16.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the status of this Mandate. The Monitor found that APD is engaged in an ongoing process of improving its accountability processes, including making changes to the work of the Force Review Board. The Monitoring Team remains in the process of reviewing APD's use of force accountability measures, including reviewing the Force Review Board's protocols. With respect to the Force Review Board, notwithstanding some significant improvements, we have not seen the degree of self-critical analysis that we believe is so important to the process. In addition, it appears that the history of individual officers involved in uses of force is not meaningfully considered during the process of evaluating whether remediation for an officer is required. The Monitoring Team's subject matter

expert will continue working with the Board to identify areas of improvement and possible revisions to its policies and will work with the APD on developing a revised use of force policy, building on the existing work of the Crime and Justice Institute, which includes developing new force-related policies for APD. The Monitoring Team's review process also includes evaluating APD's early intervention system, including relevant processes and protocols, which remains ongoing.

As noted in our Focus Issue on the *May 15, 2021 Traffic Incident*, there is much work that needs to be done relative to the FRB and related systems of accountability. This work will begin in earnest starting in the next Reporting Period. Until significant progress is made we view this Mandate as being uncertain as to whether the Monitor's expectations will be met.

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 20A

Current Status:  - (25-49% Complete. In line with Monitor expectations.)

Mandate 20A at IV A (Page 11) of the Consent Decree, entitled "Use of Force - Objectives - Culture of Coordination and Collaboration Between APD and AFR," requires that the Monitor determine if APD and AFR collaboratively develop policies and address issues where both APD and AFR are affected/involved in public safety matters; determine if training is being conducted to ensure a coordinated responses between APD and AFR and that officers and firefighters are being held accountable for violations of those policies.

The text of Mandate reads as follows:

"The City shall create a culture of collaboration between Aurora Police and Aurora Fire Rescue that is coordinated and emphasizes public safety."

The compliance definition as agreed to in the MADC, necessitates that the APD regularly meets and coordinates with AFR, and the Monitor finds no evidence of uncooperative joint response to incidents involving both APR and AFR to achieve full compliance with Mandate 20A.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the status of this Mandate for APD. The Monitor found that the APD has been working with AFR to improve inter-agency collaboration and coordination, including participating in monthly meetings among senior officials to discuss ongoing issues and concerns and in quarterly meetings between agency executive staff to address myriad issues, including coordinated responses, joint training needs, and community concerns. The quarterly executive staff meetings, which have occurred for the past five years, are scheduled to be held in 2022 on April 4, June 27, September 19, and December 12. APD also finalized a new policy on coordination with AFR, which was memorialized in section

9.06 of the Directives Manual (“Coordination with Aurora Fire Rescue and Emergency Medical Services”). We believe the Mandate is on the right track.

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 20B

Current Status:  - (25-49% Complete. In line with Monitor expectations.)

Mandate 20A at IV A (Page 11) of the Consent Decree, entitled “Use of Force - Objectives - Culture of Coordination and Collaboration Between APD and AFR,” requires that the Monitor determine if APD and AFR collaboratively develop policies and address issues where both APD and AFR are affected/involved in public safety matters; determine if training is being conducted to ensure a coordinated responses between APD and AFR and that officers and firefighters are being held accountable for violations of those policies.

The text of Mandate reads as follows:

“The City shall create a culture of collaboration between Aurora Police and Aurora Fire Rescue that is coordinated and emphasizes public safety.”

The compliance definition as agreed to in the MADC, necessitates that the AFR regularly meets and coordinates with APD, and that the Monitor finds no evidence of uncooperative joint responses to incidents involving both APR and AFR to achieve full compliance with Mandate 20B.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the status of this Mandate for AFR. The Monitor found that the AFR has been working with APD to improve inter-agency collaboration and coordination, including participating in monthly meetings among senior officials to discuss ongoing issues and concerns and in quarterly meetings between agency executive staff to address myriad issues, including coordinated responses, joint training needs, and community concerns. The quarterly executive staff meetings, which have occurred for the past five years, are scheduled to be held in 2022 on April 4, June 27, September 19, and December 12. AFR has recently revised its paramedic protocols to clarify the interoperability of joint responses by APD and EMS personnel, including eliminating recommendations from police officers to EMS personnel on administration of medical care. The consequences for violating these and other policies are memorialized in MOP 1.1. AFR is additionally developing robust trainings, to be provided jointly to AFR and APD personnel, that it intends to offer at least annually, although ongoing logistical concerns have posed barriers, including reconciling conflicting training and recruitment schedules between APD and AFR. However, executive staff at both agencies have committed to overcoming these constraints. We believe that this Mandate is on the right track.

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 24

Current Status: 🟡 - (25-49% Complete. It is uncertain if the expectations of the Monitor will be met.)

Mandate 24 at IV C (Page 13) of the Consent Decree, entitled “Use of Force – Force Review Board (Recent Changes),” requires that the Monitor determine if the recent changes to the Force Review Board (FRB) process as described in Section IV C 1-5 continue to be utilized. If APD seeks to reverse any of these changes, the Monitor will confirm appropriate consultation with the Monitor regarding the proposed changes have occurred.

The text of Mandate reads as follows:

“Since the Attorney General began the Pattern & Practice investigation, Aurora Police has already made several changes to the Force Review Board. These changes include: 1) adding a standardized process to review each use of force, 2) placing commanders at the academy on the Force Review Board to allow for more immediate feedback on training, 3) including commanders in the Force Review Board discussion of force incidents from that commander’s unit, 4) requiring commanders to follow up on training and tactical issues identified by the Force Review Board with the patrol officers in each district, and 5) adding legal counsel to the Force Review Board. If Aurora Police seeks to reverse any of the recent changes discussed in this section, it must first discuss those proposed changes with the Consent Decree Monitor following the process in Section II.A.”

The compliance definition as agreed to in the MADC, necessitates that the APD develops, disseminates, and implements its approved and finalized policies related to the Force Review Board processes to achieve full compliance with Mandate 24.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the status of this Mandate. The Monitor found that the Force Review Board continues to seek to improve its operations, incorporating feedback from the Monitoring Team’s subject matter expert and from the Crime and Justice Institute. While no reversal of any of the enumerated changes have taken place, as pointed out in the Focus Issue on the *May 15, 2021 Traffic Incident*, the Board will need to further revise its rules to ensure that critical thinking in all critical areas is being utilized. This work will begin in earnest starting in the next Reporting Period. Until significant progress is made, we view this Mandate as being uncertain if the expectations of the Monitor will be met.

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 25

Current Status:  - (0-24% Complete. It is uncertain if the expectations of the Monitor will be met.)

Mandate 25 at IV C (1)(1) (Page 14) of the Consent Decree, entitled “Use of Force – Changes to Process (Feedback for Training),” requires that the Monitor determine if the FRB modified its policies to require an evaluation of each instance when force is used in the context of the overall encounter including the circumstances leading to its use and, an evaluation of the mental capacity of the suspect based on the information presented by the investigator.

The text of Mandate reads as follows:

“In addition to these changes, the Force Review Board will, by the Force Review Board Process Improvement Deadline, modify its procedures or policies to... formalize the process of giving feedback from the Force Review Board to those in charge of academy and in-service training, District Commanders, and Aurora Fire Rescue in incidents where no policy violation occurred but practices can be improved[.] Once the new Use of Force Policies discussed above are implemented, the Force Review Board shall promptly update its procedures or policies to evaluate use of force incidents against the updated policies, working with the Consent Decree Monitor on both policies and procedures under Section II.A.”

The compliance definition as agreed to in the MADC, necessitates that the APD develops, disseminates, and implements its approved and finalized policies related to the Force Review Board processes to achieve full compliance with Mandate 25.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the status of this Mandate. The Monitor found that the Force Review Board has added representatives from the APD’s training unit and District Commands so that those representatives are made aware of training patterns and themes. The inclusion of these representatives gave them with an opportunity to work with the Board to identify training needs and provide input for in-service training for the department. The Board continues to work on updating its policies accordingly. The Monitor, however, has observed significant areas for improvement as detailed the Focus Issue on the *May 15, 2021 Traffic Incident*. The Board will need to further revise its rules to ensure that incidents are reviewed in accordance with this Mandate. This work will begin in earnest starting in the next Reporting Period. Until significant progress is made, we view this Mandate as being uncertain if the expectations of the Monitor will be met.

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 26

Current Status:  - (0-24% Complete. It is uncertain if the expectations of the Monitor will be met.)

Mandate 26 at IV C (1)(2) (Page 14) of the Consent Decree, entitled “Use of Force - Changes to Process (Review in Context),” requires that the Monitor determine if the FRB modified its policies to require an evaluation of each instance when force is used in the context of the overall encounter including the circumstances leading to its use and, an evaluation of the mental capacity of the suspect based on the information presented by the investigator.

The text of Mandate reads as follows:

“In addition to these changes, the Force Review Board will, by the Force Review Board Process Improvement Deadline, modify its procedures or policies to... review each instance of force used in the context of the overall encounter, including the circumstances leading to its use and the mental capacity of the suspect[.]”

The compliance definition as agreed to in the MADC, necessitates that the APD develops, disseminates, and implements its approved and finalized policies related to the Force Review Board processes to achieve full compliance with Mandate 26.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the status of this Mandate. The Monitor found that the Force Review Board continues to evaluate and refine its processes, and that the Board must memorialize any changes to its processes in its written policies. That being said, the Board has not yet progressed to the level of critical self-assessment that is required for the benefits of the Board to be realized. In addition, the mental status of each subject has not regularly been a point of discussion at Board meetings. The Monitor has observed significant areas for improvement as detailed the Focus Issue on the *May 15, 2021 Traffic Incident*. The Board will need to further revise its rules to ensure that incidents are reviewed in accordance with this Mandate. This work will begin in earnest starting in the next Reporting Period. Until significant progress is made, we view this Mandate as being uncertain if the expectations of the Monitor will be met.

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 27

Current Status:  - (0-24% Complete. In line with Monitor expectations.)

Mandate 27 at IV C (1)(3) (Page 14) of the Consent Decree, entitled “Use of Force - Changes to Process (Review in Context),” requires that the Monitor determine if the FRB developed reliable ways to measure the frequency of use of force, compliance with policy, injuries to subjects, the safety of officers, the use of mental health holds to detain persons, and any other relevant measures of improvement.

The text of Mandate reads as follows:

“In addition to these changes, the Force Review Board will, by the Force Review Board Process Improvement Deadline, modify its procedures or policies to... develop reliable ways to measure the frequency of use of force, compliance with policy, injuries to subjects, the safety of officers, mental health holds, and any other relevant measures of improvement[.]”

The compliance definition as agreed to in the MADC, necessitates that the APD develops, disseminates, and implements its approved and finalized policies related to the analysis of uses of force, and other Force Review Board processes to achieve full compliance with Mandate 27.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the status of this Mandate. The Monitor found that the Force Review Board must modify its procedures and policies relating to this mandate. Data collection will facilitate the Board’s reaching compliance, and the Monitoring Team’s subject matter expert will continue working with the APD on developing use of force and contacts forms for collecting and tracking necessary data. The Monitor understands that the APD is currently working on developing a new use of force form to more accurately track these metrics. We anticipate that the new form will be finalized in RP2. We believe that APD is on the right track with respect to this mandate.

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 28

Current Status:  - (25-49% Complete. In line with Monitor expectations)

Mandate 28 at IV C (2) (Page 15) of the Consent Decree, entitled “Use of Force – Collaboration with Academy and Other Sections,” requires that the Monitor Confirm that the following adopted practices have been formalized in FRB and Training policies and continue to be implemented: 1. a member of the academy staff serves on the FRB; 2. the academy member’s expertise in training is used in the evaluation of UOF cases; 3. the academy member’s experience on the FRB is used

in the development of training; and 4. Body-Worn Camera (BWC) footage shown during FRB reviews is used in recruit and in-service training classes at the academy; videos selected include both successful use of de-escalation, other techniques by APD officers, and, videos of incidents where improvement is recommended or needed.

The text of Mandate reads as follows:

“A member of the academy staff now serves on the Force Review Board and the member’s expertise in training is used in the evaluation of use of force cases and the member’s experience on the Force Review Board informs the development of training. Recently, Aurora Police developed guidance on the use of body-worn camera video shown to the Force Review Board in recruit and in-service training classes at the academy. The videos selected will include both successful use of de-escalation and other techniques by Aurora police officers, and videos of incidents where improvement is recommended or needed.”

The compliance definition as agreed to in the MADC, necessitates that the APD develops, disseminates, and implements its approved and finalized policies related to the analysis of uses of force, and other Force Review Board processes to achieve full compliance with Mandate 28.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the status of this Mandate. The Monitor found that the requirements of this mandate are being completed in practice, but that the associated APD policies must be updated accordingly. The subject matter expert will work with APD on improving its procedures and updating its departmental policies related to this Mandate in RP 2. This work will include updating relevant policies and ensuring that BWCV is being properly utilized in the Academy. With respect to this particular mandate we believe that APD is on the right track.

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 31

Current Status:  - (25-49% Complete. In line with Monitor expectations.)

Mandate 31 at IV D (3) (Page 16) of the Consent Decree, entitled “Use of Force – Training (Joint APD and AFR Training),” requires that the Monitor to determine if APD’s Use of Force training plan includes joint police and fire on scene coordination as appropriate.

The text of Mandate reads as follows:

“Aurora Police will ensure that the training described below is provided and delivered promptly, no later than the Use of Force Training Development

Deadline. 3. Joint police and fire training on scene coordination, as appropriate. [Text repeated for context]... Aurora Police will train substantially all the police personnel who interact with the public by the Use of Force Training Completion Deadline.”

The compliance definition as agreed to in the MADC, necessitates that the APD develops and delivers the approved Use of Force training to achieve full compliance with Mandate 31.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the status of this Mandate. The Monitor found that a joint training has been developed with APD and AFR but it’s unclear to what extent this joint training has been formalized as part of APD’s suite of Use of Force Training curriculum. We believe the APD is on the right track with respect to this Mandate.

DOCUMENTATION OF STOPS

INTRODUCTION

The issue of when police are permitted to interrupt someone’s liberty by arresting them, detaining them, or even engaging them in investigative questioning lies at the heart of the U.S. Constitution’s 4th Amendment and its prohibition against unreasonable seizures. The U.S. Supreme Court has, for decades, issued opinions in cases arising under the 4th Amendment that collectively set the constitutional floor for when police seizures (also known as “police stops”, “Terry Stops”²⁷ or simply as “stops”) are permitted and how they must be conducted. These opinions, and the body of case law they comprise, form the bulk of federal authority on police stops. However, state and local governments are empowered to enact legal standards that exceed federal constitutional minimums. Additionally, many state courts have interpreted state laws and constitutions as requiring stricter limitations on police stops than would otherwise be permitted under federal case law.

The cumulative body of law on police stops has resulted in the demarcation of different kinds of stops that are governed by different legal standards. For example, stops that involve the fullest deprivation of liberty, that is, arrests, are permitted only when there is probable cause to believe that a person has committed an unlawful offense. In contrast, stops involving less severe deprivations—like temporary detentions during police investigations—are governed by a more permissive standard: reasonable suspicion to believe that a person has committed or is presently

²⁷ “Terry Stop,” takes its name from the 1968 U.S. Supreme Court case—Terry v. Ohio—that first articulated the federal constitutional minimum standard for conducting such stops.

committing an unlawful offense. For individual police officers, knowing how to identify which legal standards apply to a given interaction with a member of the public is crucial for ensuring that the officer's conduct meets all applicable requirements.

In the aggregate, knowing the total number of stops committed by officers—and the number of each kind of stop (vehicular, pedestrian or other non-vehicular), and what police action followed the stop (frisk, search, seizure)—can be critical for public safety oversight efforts. Data on police stops are relevant when evaluating a police department's adherence to the principles and requirements of constitutional policing and can help identify areas of both success and needed improvement. Accordingly, some states, including Colorado, have imposed data collection mandates on police departments, requiring them to document police stops and issue regular reports.

Colorado's requirement, enacted under a landmark law enforcement reform law in 2020 (Senate Bill 20-217, or "SB20-217"), requires each local police department, including the APD, to report "[a]ll data relating to contacts conducted by its peace officers." The law defines the term "contacts" to mean "an interaction with an individual, whether or not the person is in a motor vehicle, initiated by a peace officer, whether consensual or nonconsensual, for the purpose of enforcing the law or investigating possible violations of the law." This definition encompasses the kinds of stops that are governed by federal and state constitutional law. "Contacts" data that must be reported under the law include the demographics of each individual stopped, data relating to the times, dates, and locations of contacts; the outcomes of contacts, including arrests, warnings, and property seizures; and actions taken by police officers during the contact.

HISTORY AND BASIS FOR CONSENT DECREE MANDATES

In its September 15 report, the Colorado Attorney General's Office noted that APD has a pattern and practice of failing to abide by the data collection mandates enacted under SB 20-217. The law requires that officers have a legal basis for any "contact" (as defined in the law) with a member of the public and imposes strict recordkeeping requirements whenever any such contact is made. The Attorney General found that, under policies that have been in place since 2020—after SB20-217 was enacted—APD officers conducted resident stops without recording them. As a result, oversight efforts have been hampered by a lack of documentation over APD's enforcement and investigative conduct. The Attorney General also found that the APD's policies did not provide adequate guidance to officers on when an officer may conduct a Terry Stop.

CONSENT DECREE'S OBJECTIVES

The Consent Decree seeks the development of a documentation system that complies with state law, allows for prompt and transparent review of officer behavior, and improves the ability of APD to identify successes and areas for improvement.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Policies are going to be developed to provide guidance on the legal requirements applicable to the different types of investigative and enforcement encounters in which police officers engage, including for all contacts as defined in SB20-217, and to implement data collection requirements that comply with state law. Such policies will be developed by the Documentation of Contacts Policy Adoption Deadline (90 days) and Stops Policy Deadline (120 days).

TRAINING IMPLICATIONS

Training must be developed to include scenario-based modules for implementing the newly developed Documentation of Contacts and Stops policies by the Stops Policy Training Deadline (180 days). Aurora Police will train substantially all the police personnel who interact with the public by the Stops Training Completion Deadline (365 days).

OPERATIONAL INTEGRITY IMPLICATIONS

After the newly developed policies are implemented and the training is completed, the Monitoring Team will evaluate for operational integrity. Prior to full post-implementation monitoring, the Team will establish a baseline by understanding how contacts are captured on body-worn cameras and how they are subsequently documented.

DATA UTILIZATION

The Monitoring Team needs to determine which data does and does not exist. To establish a baseline prior to the implementation of policies and completion of training, the Team will sample body-worn camera footage and participate in "ride-alongs" with APD officers. Upon the completed implementation of policies and training, the Team will sample body-worn camera footage, review associated documentation of contacts, participate in ride-alongs, and review a sampling of individuals contacted by the police. The Team will also review complaints from the public and associated police documentation to ensure compliance with the implemented policies and training.

PROGRESS AND NOTABLE OBSERVATIONS FROM THIS REPORTING PERIOD

In 2020, prior to the adoption of the Consent Decree, APD implemented Directive Manual section 8.48 (“Suspicious Calls”), to provide direct guidance to officers on responding to calls alleging suspicious behaviors or persons. The policy requires officers to use their own observations to evaluate any such behaviors or persons and to rely on their first-person observations when deciding whether—and, if so, how—to initiate contact with a subject. This policy recognizes that some third-party descriptions of a person or their behaviors may be influenced by personally-held biases, and that police should not sure such descriptions as the sole basis for initiating a contact.

Additionally, APD conducted training in 2021 to address critical decision-making during in-progress calls, particularly during traffic stops. The training was spurred by an incident involving a traffic stop of a mother and her minor children, which included their being handcuffed, that was initiated on the mistaken belief that the car they occupied had been stolen. The training was mandatory for all officers and covered fact-checking, pre- and post-stop behavioral indicators, tactics, and decision-making techniques.

During RP1, the Monitoring Team reviewed all relevant policies, including Directives Manual sections 4.02 (“Emergency Response and Police Vehicle Pursuits”), 6.01 (“Arrest Procedure”), 8.18 (“Field Interview”), 8.32 (“Bias-based Policing”), and 8.04 (“Observers at Scenes of Police Incidents”). The Monitoring Team also reviewed Section 08.32 of APD’s Directives Manual on bias-based policing and other policies relating to the department’s investigative process, including those pertaining to contacts, field interviews, reasonable suspicion, and responding to calls alleging suspicious behaviors. This review revealed that APD lacks a policy dedicated to the conduct of pedestrian and vehicular stops and the legally permissible bases for such stops. However, APD has begun to improve its policies and is drafting new policies dedicated to constitutional policing during stops and investigative encounters.

The Team also reviewed assorted training curricula, including those pertaining to courses on routine vehicular contacts, basic search and seizure, preliminary investigations, pedestrian contacts, in-progress calls, patrol observations and perception, identification of suspects, vehicle searches, tactical vehicle stops, legal justifications for stops, the 4th Amendment, and vehicle contacts. The Team also reviewed relevant case law concerning police stops in Colorado.

Within this initial reporting period, APD has worked with the Monitoring Team to meet the deadlines on the Consent Decree’s mandates on documentation of stops. A new Contacts Form was developed and will be rolled out during RP 2. The new policy relating to the documentation of contacts was completed during this Reporting Period and will be published early in RP 2.

THIS REPORTING PERIOD'S ASSESSMENTS OF INDIVIDUAL MANDATES IN THE SECTION

During this Reporting Period the Monitor assessed four of the seven Mandates in this section as follows:

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 33

Current Status: 🟡 - (25-49% Complete. It is uncertain if the expectations of the Monitor will be met)

Mandate 33 at V A (Page 17) of the Consent Decree, entitled "Documentation of Stops - Objectives," requires that the Monitor determine if the City has developed a documentation system for all "Contacts" as defined by Colorado Senate Bill (SB) 217 and that it contains all required information. It requires verification that the system permits prompt reviews of officer behavior and that the use of the data within the system has the potential for identifying successes and areas for improvement related to individual officers and/or policy updates or training opportunities.

The text of Mandate reads as follows:

"The City shall develop a documentation system that complies with state law, allows for prompt and transparent review of officer behavior, and improves the ability of Aurora Police to identify successes and areas for improvement. The Parties recognize that recent legislative changes require a comprehensive update to the City's practices, which will take time to implement. The City will ensure that compliance with these statutes will occur within the time periods identified in this section."

The compliance definition as agreed to in the MADC, necessitates that the APD develop its Stops documentation system in compliance with Colorado state law to achieve full compliance with Mandate 31.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the status of this Mandate. The Monitor found that the APD is working on developing its data collection capabilities, including finalizing the rollout and operationalization of new policies and protocols. That being said, the development and rollout are behind schedule, and although there were reasonable explanations for the delays, fulfilling this Mandate expeditiously is extremely important. Until full rollout and training with respect to data collection, the Monitor views this Mandate as being uncertain if the expectations of the Monitor will be met.

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 34

Current Status:  - (0-24% Complete. It is uncertain if the expectations of the Monitor will be met)

Mandate 34 at V B (1) (Page 17) of the Consent Decree, entitled “Documentation of Stops – Policy Changes (General Principle),” requires that the Monitor to determine if APD developed policies in compliance with existing Colorado state law. It further requires the Monitor to determine if all related policies were developed, finalized, and disseminated, and if all training was delivered within a reasonably close timeframe. Finally, it requires the Monitor to determine if the related platforms [contacts documentation system] contains all required information and links information for all involved officers to the connected contact.

The text of Mandate reads as follows:

“Aurora Police will develop policies that comply with existing law as soon as practicable, and, in any event, no later than the Stops Policy Deadline. The City shall work to develop policies in a comprehensive manner that reduces the need for multiple trainings and policy updates. In addition to compliance with applicable law, the policies and platforms supporting the policies shall link information about officers involved with the stops to the required information about stops.”

The compliance definition as agreed to in the MADC, necessitates that the APD develops, disseminates, and implements its approved and finalized policies related to Stops to achieve full compliance with Mandate 34.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the status of this Mandate. The Monitor found that APD created a new Documentation of Contacts policy, but finalization of the policy was impacted by the failure of the Department to have a governance structure around the development and finalization process. The policy had yet to be rolled out as of the end of RP1. APD has also, by the end of RP1, not yet begun developing a new Contacts (Stops) policy. Until full rollout and training with respect to data collection, the Monitor views this Mandate as being uncertain if the expectations of the Monitor will be met.

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 36

Current Status: 🟡 - (50-74% Complete. It is uncertain if the expectations of the Monitor will be met)

Mandate 36 at V (2)(b) (Page 18) of the Consent Decree, entitled “Documentation of Stops- Policy Changes – Creation of New Policies (Recordkeeping Requirements),” requires that the Monitor determine if the APD created a new policy for implementing the data collection requirements of C.R.S. §§ 24-31-309(3.5) and 24-31-903.

The text of Mandate reads as follows:

“Aurora Police will create a new policy for implementing the data collection requirements of C.R.S. §§ 24-31-309(3.5) and 24-31-903.”

The compliance definition as agreed to in the MADC, necessitates that the APD develops and implements its approved and finalized policies related to Stops documentation to achieve full compliance with Mandate 36.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the status of this Mandate. The Monitor found that APD, with Monitor assistance, has drafted a policy meeting the requirements of the Mandate but, in large part because of the lack of governance previously referenced, had not yet disseminated or implemented the policy. Until full rollout and training with respect to data collection, the Monitor views this Mandate as being uncertain if the expectations of the Monitor will be met.

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 37

Current Status: 🟡 - (50-74% Complete. It is uncertain if the expectations of the Monitor will be met)

Mandate 37 at V C (Page 18) of the Consent Decree, entitled “Documentation of Stops – Training Plan Development,” requires that the Monitor determine if APD developed a Training Plan that sufficiently covers stops/contacts policies.

The text of Mandate reads as follows:

“Aurora Police will develop a training plan including, but not limited to, curriculum, material, and, if needed, scenario-based modules, in consultation with the Consent Decree Monitor and, as needed, outside experts, for implementing

the new policies and for any revisions of current policies required by the Stops Training Plan Deadline.”

The compliance definition as agreed to in the MADC, necessitates that the APD develops an approved training curricula related to its Stops policies to achieve full compliance with Mandate 37.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the status of this Mandate. The Monitor found that APD has not finalized the required policy for Documentation of Contacts but has substantially developed new training, which will be administered once the policy and relevant forms are disseminated to APD personnel. Until training is rolled out with respect to data collection, the Monitor views this Mandate as unacceptably behind schedule.

USE OF KETAMINE AND OTHER SEDATIVES AS CHEMICAL RESTRAINT

INTRODUCTION

The term “chemical restraint” comprises a broad category of chemicals that are administered for the purpose of reducing aggression, violence, or agitation in people experiencing acute mental distress, including those experiencing what had often been classified as “excited delirium.”²⁸ The diagnosis was used to describe a medical emergency characterized by a combination of acute confusion, distress, agitation, and aggression, often triggered by the consumption of stimulant narcotics like cocaine, methamphetamine, phencyclidine (PCP), and lysergic acid diethylamide (LSD). However, recent discussion about how excited delirium is disproportionately used against Black people have been raised to spur the discussion about whether and how the term should be used in the medical field. This discussion emerged most recently after the murder of George Floyd when an officer at the scene was heard saying, “I am worried about excited delirium or whatever.” While delirium is well-defined and described in the Diagnostics and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, excited delirium is not listed in the manual.

²⁸ Excited delirium is a controversial diagnosis, typically diagnosed in young adult males, disproportionately black, who were physically restrained at the time of death, most often by law enforcement. (Position Statement on Concerns About Use of the Term “Excited Delirium” and Appropriate Medical Management in Out of Hospital Contexts (Report) American Psychiatric Association.) <https://www.psychiatry.org/File%20Library/About-APA/Organization-Documents-Policies/Policies/Position-Use-of-Term-Excited-Delirium.pdf>

Among the drugs most commonly used as a chemical restraint is ketamine, which is categorized as a dissociative anesthetic due to its sedative and amnesiac qualities.

Although administration of chemical restraints in emergency crisis situations is a common medical practice, the use of chemical restraints is not without controversy. Opponents of the practice have alleged that chemical restraints are disproportionately used against vulnerable populations and that they are often administered as a measure of first resort in lieu of other effective crisis management strategies like de-escalation. Critics also claim that chemical restraints are often incorrectly dosed, leading to life-threatening complications for patients who are improperly monitored post-administration. Aurora Fire Rescue, up until the death of Elijah McClain, used the drug ketamine as a chemical restraint in cases of excited delirium, but has since suspended its use by AFR paramedics. Today, AFR uses a slower-acting chemical restraint, Versed, for those situations which, in medical judgement of paramedics on the scene, the chemical restraint is medically appropriate. This medical judgement is reviewed in every instance by the Medical Director of AFR.

HISTORY AND BASIS FOR CONSENT DECREE MANDATES

After the death of Elijah McClain, AFR's use of ketamine as a chemical restraint was scrutinized by multiple bodies, including the Colorado Attorney General's Office and an Independent Review Panel (IRP) commissioned by the Aurora City Council. The IRP concluded that AFR personnel committed multiple errors throughout their treatment of Elijah McClain, including during their administration of ketamine to chemically restrain him. The AG concluded that AFR had a pattern and practice of using ketamine in violation of the law. These errors included an inadequate assessment of Mr. McClain's medical condition prior to administering ketamine, inaccurate estimations of Mr. McClain's body weight for purposes of determining a correct dose of ketamine to administer, and a failure by AFR paramedics to assert control over Mr. McClain's treatment after their arrival on the scene.

The Attorney General's Office further found that AFR had a pattern and practice of administering ketamine illegally. These patterns and practices including administering ketamine reflexively upon the request of a police officer without first conducting a proper medical evaluation of a patient, administering ketamine doses that exceeded those allowed under AFR protocols, failing to adequately monitor patients post-administration, and a failure by AFR medical supervisors to follow agency protocols to prevent future violations by AFR paramedics.

As a response to the controversy surrounding Mr. McClain's death, the Colorado state legislature enacted a new law prohibiting the administration of ketamine on "police-involved patients unless a justifiable medical emergency required its use." The law further removed "excited delirium" as

a recognized basis for administering ketamine for such individuals. Since April 2021, AFR has agreed not to use ketamine as a chemical restraint and, via AFR policy, prohibited its use. Nonetheless, the City, for the term of the Decree, has agreed to abide by review protocols set forth in the Decree should it seek to reinstitute ketamine for use as a chemical restraint or seek to use any other chemical as a restraint.

The Consent Decree requires the Monitor to “periodically review Aurora Fire Rescue’s use of chemical sedatives as chemical restraint to confirm policy compliance.” It further requires the Monitor to “review and analyze the coordination of policies of Aurora Police and Aurora Fire Rescue to ensure that members of Aurora Police do not recommend, suggest, or otherwise encourage the use of any chemical restraint in the field by Aurora Fire Rescue,” requiring the decision to apply such chemical restraints to be made only by qualified AFR personnel pursuant to applicable medical protocols. Finally, the Decree imposes procedural requirements for reviewing any proposal by AFR to resume the use of ketamine as a chemical restraint at any point during the monitorship period.

CONSENT DECREE’S OBJECTIVES

The Consent Decree to prohibit the use of ketamine by AFR during the monitorship period without explicit approval from the Monitor, and to monitor the circumstances of the use of any chemical sedative by AFR.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

If AFR wishes to reinstate ketamine, its policies and procedures should reflect strict compliance with the state law and any waiver requirements. With respect to the administration of other chemical sedatives, AFR policies must include that the administration of such sedatives must be based solely on their medical judgement without reliance on the non-medical judgement of APD officers.

TRAINING IMPLICATIONS

If AFR wishes to reinstate ketamine, its training should reflect strict compliance with the state law and any waiver requirements. With respect to the administration of other chemical sedatives, training must include when chemical sedatives can be administered and the prohibition of reliance on non-medical judgements of APD officers in determining the appropriateness of such administration.

OPERATIONAL INTEGRITY IMPLICATIONS

The Monitoring Team will evaluate for operational integrity by monitoring use of all chemical restraints by AFR to ensure ketamine is not re-introduced without explicit approval from the Monitor.

DATA UTILIZATION

To establish a baseline of chemical restraint use by AFR, we will review usage prior to the implementation of the Consent Decree and continue to review all use of chemical restraint use by AFR and participate in “ride-alongs” with AFR.

PROGRESS AND NOTABLE OBSERVATIONS FROM THIS REPORTING PERIOD

The Monitoring Team reviewed AFR chemical sedation reports from Q4 2021 and Q1 2022 and body-worn camera footage of joint responses of APD and AFR personnel where chemical sedation was administered from March and April of 2022. The footage was recorded from APD body-worn cameras, as AFR does not currently equip its personnel with such cameras. However, the Monitoring Team notes that AFR needs access to any available footage to better ensure it continually improves its chemical restraint practices. AFR has consistently reiterated a commitment to no longer using ketamine as a chemical restraint but will adhere to the Consent Decree’s procedural requirements in the event it seeks to reinstate ketamine’s use. The Monitoring Team reviewed AFR’s policies, including MOP section 6.13 (“Coordination with Aurora Police Department/Law Enforcement”) and APD’s policies, including Directives Manual section 9.06 (“Coordination with AFR”). The Team further reviewed AFR’s emergency medical services protocols.

THIS REPORTING PERIOD’S ASSESSMENTS OF INDIVIDUAL MANDATES IN THE SECTION

During this Reporting Period the Monitor assessed all nine Mandates in this section as follows:

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 40

Current Status: ● - (Substantial Compliance)

Mandate 40 VI A (Page 20) of the Consent Decree, entitled “Use of Ketamine and Other Sedatives as a Chemical Restraint – Objectives,” requires that the Monitor will verify that ketamine is not being use in the field during the time Consent Decree is in effect without explicit agreement of the Consent Decree Monitor that its use complies with applicable law in consultation with the Aurora Fire Rescue Medical Director

The text of Mandate reads as follows:

“If the City seeks to use ketamine in the field during the time that any part of this Consent Decree remains in effect, the Consent Decree Monitor will first review the medical protocol for the use of ketamine. Aurora Fire Rescue may not use ketamine in the field during the effective period of this Consent Decree without the agreement of the Consent Decree Monitor that its use complies with applicable law in consultation with the Aurora Fire Rescue Medical Director. Any objections that cannot be resolved will be resolved using the agreed dispute resolution procedure outlined below in Section XI.”

The compliance definition as agreed to in the MADC, if the City does not use ketamine, or notification and approval are received prior to use if ketamine is used to achieve compliance with Mandate 40.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the status of this Mandate. The Monitor found that, as of September 15, 2020, AFR had removed ketamine from its protocols thus prohibiting its administration and has not sought to reinstate its use. AFR has further continually reiterated its intention to maintain ketamine’s removal from its treatment protocols indefinitely. As such, the Monitor finds this Mandate in full compliance, but will continue monitoring in each Reporting Period.

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 41

Current Status: ● - (Substantial Compliance)

Mandate 41 VI A (Page 20) of the Consent Decree, entitled “Use of Ketamine and Other Sedatives as a Chemical Restraint – Objectives,” requires that the Monitor determine if AFR’s policies and procedures reflect strict compliance with state law and any waiver requirements and closely review use of these sedatives to confirm policy compliance.

The text of Mandate reads as follows:

“The Parties share the goal of ensuring that the use of any chemical sedatives as chemical restraints in the field is done in accordance with applicable law and other requirements. The Report did not investigate the use of other chemical sedatives as chemical restraints in the field by Aurora Fire Rescue because ketamine was one of the two administered chemical sedatives used during the period of review by the Attorney General’s office and it received substantial public scrutiny. Therefore, for other chemical sedatives used as a chemical restraint, Aurora Fire will (1) ensure that policies and procedures reflect strict compliance with state law

and any waiver requirements, and (2) closely review use of these sedatives to confirm policy compliance. This agreement is not intended to interfere with the Medical Director's determination of the need for and requirements for waivers for other controlled substances. The Consent Decree Monitor will periodically review Aurora Fire Rescue's use of chemical sedatives as chemical restraints to confirm policy compliance."

The compliance definition as agreed to in the MADC, necessitates that the AFR develop, disseminate, and implement an approved policy related to the use of chemical restraints to achieve compliance with Mandate 41.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the status of this Mandate. The Monitor found that AFR has modified its practices to improve oversight of the use of chemical restraints by its personnel. This includes requiring the AFR Medical Director to review all incidents involving administration of a chemical restraint through the agency's Continuous Quality Improvement process. Through this process, the Medical Director reviews a monthly report that compiles information on all calls where a chemical restraint was administered, including outcomes. This process was implemented prior to the Consent Decree's enactment and remains in place. The Monitor will work with APD to allow access to BWCV of incidents in which chemical sedatives are administered in order to provide for a more fulsome review by AFR. The Monitor believes that AFR is in substantial compliance with this Mandate and will continue to periodically review the Mandate to ensure continued compliance.

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 42

Current Status: ● - (Substantial Compliance)

Mandate 42 at VI A (Page 21) of the Consent Decree, entitled "Use of Ketamine and Other Sedatives as Chemical Restraint – Objectives," requires that the Monitor determine that coordination of policies of AFR and APD do not recommend, suggest, or otherwise encourage the use of any chemical restraint in the field by AFR. The Monitor will confirm that any decision to use chemical restraints in the field was made by qualified members of AFR only in accordance with the applicable medical protocols in effect and approved by AFR's medical director in compliance with C.R.S. § 26-20-104 et seq.

The text of Mandate reads as follows:

"The Consent Decree Monitor will review and analyze the coordination of policies of Aurora Police and Aurora Fire Rescue to ensure that members of Aurora Police do not recommend, suggest, or otherwise encourage the use of any chemical

restraint in the field by Aurora Fire Rescue. The use of any chemical restraint in the field will be a decision made only by qualified members of Aurora Fire Rescue and the applicable medical protocols in effect and approved by Aurora Fire's medical director in compliance with C.R.S. § 26-20-104 et seq."

The compliance definition as agreed to in the MADC, necessitates that the AFR develop, disseminate, and implement an approved policy related to the use of chemical restraints to achieve compliance with Mandate 42.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the status of this Mandate. The Monitor found substantial compliance with the mandate in that both APD's and AFR's, including EMS protocols and department policies, including MOP 6.13, are in place and meet the mandate's requirements. Training and written communications have been implemented to reinforce AFR's protocols on the use of chemical restraint, and AFR personnel are allowed to treat patients based only on their own medical judgment on the needs of patients in their care. AFR monitors compliance with its chemical restraint policies and modified its field report to include a mandatory data field that documents the presence of law enforcement on scene during any call in which a chemical sedative is administered, and, if so, whether law enforcement made any recommendation or suggestion on the use of the sedative. The Monitor reviewed BWC footage of every instance during March, April and May 2022 in which chemical sedative was administered and recorded on BWC to determine if policy and training were being followed. We found in every instance reviewed that policy was followed. As such, the Monitor finds this Mandate in full compliance, but will continue monitoring in each Reporting Period.

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 43

Current Status: ● - (Substantial Compliance)

Mandate 43 at VI A (Page 21) of the Consent Decree, entitled "Use of Ketamine and Other Sedatives as Chemical Restraint – Objectives," requires that the Monitor determine if the APD and AFR meet to resolve any objections raised by the Consent Decree Monitor.

The text of Mandate reads as follows:

"The Consent Decree Monitor will meet and confer with each Department to resolve any objections raised by the Consent Decree Monitor. Any objections that cannot be resolved will be resolved using the agreed dispute resolution procedure outlined below in Section XI."

The compliance definition as agreed to in the MADC, necessitates that the APD and AFR meet and resolve any issues regarding the use of chemical restraints to achieve compliance with Mandate 43.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the status of this Mandate. The Monitor found substantial compliance with the mandate in that APD and AFR as no issues or objections were raised. As such, the Monitor finds this Mandate in full compliance, but will continue monitoring in each Reporting Period.

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 44

Current Status: ● - (Substantial Compliance)

Mandate 44 at VI C (Page 21) of the Consent Decree, entitled “Use of Ketamine and Other Sedatives as a Chemical Restraint – Policy Changes if Ketamine is Used,” requires that the Monitor confirm that ketamine is not being used in the field. If AFR wants to reinstate ketamine use, the Monitor will ensure that the policy dictates appropriate dosage recommendations and a procedure for how members of AFR will assess the level of patient agitation that would lead to the use of ketamine in the field.

The text of Mandate reads as follows:

“The City and Aurora Fire Rescue have stated they do not intend to use ketamine again in the field, but if Aurora Fire Rescue does seek to reinstate ketamine usage in the field, Aurora Fire Rescue will work with the Consent Decree Monitor under Section II.A. The Consent Decree Monitor will work with the Medical Director to specifically focus on policy and procedure to ensure the policy dictates appropriate dosage recommendations and a procedure for how members of Aurora Fire Rescue will assess the level of patient agitation that would lead to the use of ketamine in the field.”

The compliance definition as agreed to in the MADC, necessitates that the AFR does not use ketamine, or if so receives approval of policy from with Monitor and Medical Director prior to implementation to achieve compliance with Mandate 44.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the status of this Mandate and found the City to be in substantial compliance. The Monitor found that, as of September 15, 2020, AFR had removed ketamine from its protocols thus prohibiting its administration and has not sought to reinstate its use. AFR has further continually reiterated its intention to maintain ketamine’s

removal from its treatment protocols indefinitely. As such, the Monitor finds this Mandate in full compliance, but will continue monitoring in each Reporting Period.

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 45

Current Status: ● - (Substantial Compliance)

Mandate 44 at VI D (Page 23) of the Consent Decree, entitled “Use of Ketamine and Other Sedatives as a Chemical Restraint – Process Changes,” requires that the Monitor will determine if AFR developed a procedure for post-incident analysis before using ketamine in the field.

The text of Mandate reads as follows:

“Aurora Fire Rescue will develop a procedure for post-incident analysis that the Consent Decree Monitor must agree with, using the procedures in Section II.A, before Aurora Fire Rescue may use ketamine in the field.”

The compliance definition as agreed to in the MADC, necessitates that AFR not use ketamine, or if so and has received an approved policy, conducts post-incident reviews as required to achieve compliance with Mandate 45.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the status of this Mandate and found the City to be in substantial compliance. The Monitor found that, as of September 15, 2020, AFR had removed ketamine from its protocols thus prohibiting its administration and has not sought to reinstate its use. AFR has further continually reiterated its intention to maintain ketamine’s removal from its treatment protocols indefinitely. As such, the Monitor finds this Mandate in full compliance, but will continue monitoring in each Reporting Period.

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 46

Current Status: ● - (Substantial Compliance)

Mandate 46 at VI D (Page 23) of the Consent Decree, entitled “Use of Ketamine and Other Sedatives as a Chemical Restraint – Evaluation of Chemical Sedation,” requires that the Monitor determine if the AFR developed a process to periodically review its use of chemical sedation in the field to determine what improvements should be made to policy or training at AFR or APD, including assessing 1) whether the symptoms justified sedation under law and policy, 2) the involvement of police officers before or during a patient’s sedation, and 3) what factors increase the risk of adverse outcomes to patients or providers

The text of Mandate reads as follows:

“In addition to the current process of reviewing each incident where Aurora Fire Rescue uses chemical sedation as a chemical restraint in the field, Aurora Fire Rescue shall develop a process to periodically review its use of chemical sedation in the field to determine what improvements should be made to policy or training at Aurora Fire Rescue or Aurora Police, including assessing 1) whether the symptoms justified sedation under law and policy, 2) the involvement of police officers before or during a patient’s sedation, and 3) what factors increase the risk of adverse outcomes to patients or providers.”

The compliance definition as agreed to in the MADC, necessitates that the AFR develop, disseminate, and implement an approved policy related to the post-incident review of uses of chemical restraints to achieve compliance with Mandate 46.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the status of this Mandate. The Monitor found that AFR has reviewed 100% of calls involving the use of sedatives to manage combative patients, having started such reviews prior to the Consent Decree’s enactment. The reviews are conducted by AFR’s Medical Director pursuant to its Continuous Quality Improvement program, and the agency intends to conduct a 6-month retrospective review of relevant calls during the summer of 2022, which will seek to identify trends, review current treatment protocols, and determine any training needs. AFR further reports that it is improving its electronic medical record system to allow data to be analyzed using outside analytic programs, with the system’s upgrade planned to be completed later this year. The Monitor will arrange for access by AFR to BWCs that pertain to incidents of the administration of chemical sedatives. We find this Mandate to be in substantial compliance and will continue to monitor it going forward.

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 47

Current Status:  - (Substantial Compliance)

Mandate 47 at VI D (2) (Page 23) of the Consent Decree, entitled “Evaluation of Chemical sedation,” requires that the Monitor determine if the AFR summarized its periodic reviews to the Consent Decree Monitor at least twice a year, starting 6 months from the effective date. Confirm that the summary includes at a minimum, information about the number of times Aurora Fire Rescue used chemical sedation as a chemical restraint, the symptoms justifying sedation, the type of chemical restraint used, whether Aurora Fire Rescue followed policy, what information police officers provided to Aurora Fire Rescue for compliance with C.R.S. § 18-8- 805, and basic information about the use such as the tabular data included on pages 97-98 of the AG’s Report.

The text of Mandate reads as follows:

“Aurora Fire Rescue shall summarize this periodic review to the Consent Decree Monitor at least twice a year, starting 6 months from the effective date. This summary will include at least information about the number of times Aurora Fire Rescue used chemical sedation as a chemical restraint, the symptoms justifying sedation, the type of chemical restraint used, whether Aurora Fire Rescue followed policy, what information police officers provided to Aurora Fire Rescue for compliance with C.R.S. § 18-8-805, and basic information about the use such as the tabular data included on pages 97-98 of the Report. Nothing in this section should be construed to discourage Aurora Police from providing Aurora Fire Rescue with necessary information about an incident, as this information will only be used to comply with C.R.S. § 18-8-805(2)(b). This requirement does not require the public disclosure of any confidential information.”

The compliance definition as agreed to in the MADC, necessitates that the AFR conducts the requisite post-incident review of uses of chemical restraints to achieve compliance with Mandate 47.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the status of this Mandate. The Monitor found that AFR had reviewed 100% of calls involving the use of sedatives to manage combative patients, having started such reviews prior to the Consent Decree’s enactment. The reviews are conducted by AFR’s Medical Director pursuant to its Continuous Quality Improvement program, and the agency intends to conduct a 6-month retrospective review of relevant calls during the summer of 2022, which will seek to identify trends, review current treatment protocols, and determine any training needs. AFR further reports that it is improving its electronic medical record system to allow data to be analyzed using outside analytic programs, with the system’s upgrade planned to be completed later this year. The Monitor will arrange for access by AFR to BWCs that pertain to incidents of the administration of chemical sedatives. Assuming that the reviews relative to this Mandate continue, AFR will be in substantial compliance in the next reporting period, which will allow for the required six-month review.

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 48

Current Status: ● - (Substantial Compliance)

Mandate 44 at VI E (Page 24) of the Consent Decree, entitled “Use of Ketamine and Other Sedatives as a Chemical Restraint – Goals and Measurement” requires that the Monitor will review any use of ketamine regularly, and include such review in the Court reports addressing at

least the issues identified in the AG’s Report, if the City implements the use of ketamine in the field again after completing the Monitor-approved process. In reporting such information, the Monitor will include its assessment of the proper use of ketamine, if any, as described in the Compliance Definition below.

The text of Mandate reads as follows:

“If the City implements the use of ketamine in the field again using the process set forth above, the Monitor will review any use regularly and include such review in the Court reports addressing at least the issues identified in the Report on the reporting timetables set forth in Section IX.A.5.”

The compliance definition as agreed to in the MADC, necessitates that AFR does not use ketamine, or if so only does so when justified to achieve compliance with Mandate 48.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the status of this Mandate and found the City to be in substantial compliance. The Monitor found that, as of September 15, 2020, AFR had removed ketamine from its protocols thus prohibiting its administration and has not sought to reinstate its use. AFR has further continually reiterated its intention to maintain ketamine’s removal from its treatment protocols indefinitely. As such, the Monitor finds this Mandate in full compliance, but will continue monitoring in each Reporting Period.

RECRUITMENT, HIRING AND PROMOTION

INTRODUCTION

Police departments have faced difficulty hiring over the past decade, but those difficulties have been severely exacerbated by high-profile policing controversies whose impact extends beyond the departments in which the controversies originated. Police departments have seen diminished interest in pursuing a career in policing by prospective recruits and diminishing officer morale has led to higher-than-normal attrition in many departments. Although these trends have been linked to recent developments like protests for racial justice the perception among many officers that public opinion has turned against the profession. Given this dynamic it is not surprising that problems in recruitment, hiring and retention are at an all-time high.

APD has not been immune to the national trends concerning officer recruitment, hiring, and promotion. In fact, the trends in the APD have been stark, with nearly 20% of APD officers leaving the agency in the 18-month period between January 2020 and July 2021, as noted by the Colorado Attorney General’s September 15, 2021, report. Officers interviewed by representatives of the Attorney General’s Office cited a series of factors that contributed to the

department's high rate of attrition in this period, including lack of community support, lack of direction and accountability within the department, and concerns about the overall trajectory of the policing profession. The Attorney General's report noted that APD's retention problems in particular have led to staffing insufficiencies and a loss of institutional experience throughout the department's ranks, from patrol officers to higher executives.

Although the Attorney General found in its Report that AFR had not experienced the same difficulties relating to departmental turnover, morale, and community relations, AFR leadership has nonetheless expressed concern over the uncertain impact that recent legislation will have on the agency and its personnel, as well as liability concerns that could affect their work. The Attorney General's report further noted recent controversies that could impact recruitment efforts, including the use of racially derogatory language by a since-terminated Deputy Chief.

Any significant overhaul of the recruitment and hiring processes for APD and AFR necessarily implicates Aurora's Civil Service Commission, which is empowered to control hiring of police and fire personnel. The Aurora City Charter, as noted by the Attorney General's report, "grants the Commission sole responsibility for the examination and certification of all entry-level applicants to the police and fire departments." In practice this has been broadly interpreted and established in CSC practices, in a way that removed any significant input from the Departments in entry-level hiring. Any proposal to change how police officers, firefighters, or EMS personnel are hired will thus require an modification of the hiring process to be more inclusive of APD and AFR.

HISTORY AND BASIS FOR CONSENT DECREE MANDATES

APD's high attrition rate has led to concerns that critical policing functions will either be left unstaffed or will be staffed by newer recruits who both lack significant experience and who must rely on a shrunken pool of senior officers for mentorship and guidance. An associated worry is that these deficiencies could increase the number of critical incident events or worsen their outcomes.

To identify potential solutions to APD's personnel problems, the Decree mandates a revisitation of the City's recruitment and hiring of police officers and fire fighters.

These processes are bifurcated between the APD or AFR, on the one hand, and the Aurora Civil Service Commission, with the former handling the City's recruitment of candidates and the latter exclusively responsible for the hiring process including making final hiring decisions. Notably, the Commission also oversees the disciplinary process for APD and AFR personnel, as well as that for promotion within the ranks. The Decree requires both agencies to work with the Commission to review and identify potential changes to minimum qualifications for new agency recruits and

lateral hires, among other mandates. The goal of these mandates is to improve the transparency and accountability of the City's recruitment of key first-responder personnel and the civil service process that dictates their hiring.

CONSENT DECREE OBJECTIVES

The Consent Decree seeks to transform APD's and AFR's recruiting and hiring processes to create a more diverse and qualified workforce. It further seeks APD's and AFR's commitment to developing a culture of continuous improvement within each agency and to becoming better police and fire departments overall. Finally, the Decree seeks to improve transparency, accountability, and predictability in each agency's discipline review process, and to improve the role of the Civil Service Commission in APD and AFR hiring, promotion, and discipline.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

APD and AFR are required to develop written recruitment plans to attract and retain a quality work force that better reflects the diversity of the City and the Civil Service Commission to make any applicable changes to the minimum qualification for entry-level police and fire recruits and lateral hires, and applicable and relevant policies in City's hiring process so APD and AFR can assume a much more active role in the hiring of candidates.

TRAINING IMPLICATIONS

Not applicable.

OPERATIONAL INTEGRITY IMPLICATIONS

The Monitoring Team will evaluate changes the City makes to transform recruiting, hiring, promotion, and the APR and AFR discipline process to improve transparency, accountability, and predictability and to create a more diverse and qualified workforce for both agencies.

DATA UTILIZATION

The Monitoring Team needs to fully determine which data does and does not exist to effectively track and identify potential disparate impact on minority applicants and potential barriers on successfully on-boarding diverse and qualified applicants. The Team will further examine historical data to determine how the City can transform its recruiting, hiring, promotion, and disciplinary processes.

PROGRESS AND NOTABLE OBSERVATIONS FROM THE REPORTING PERIOD

The Monitoring Team has begun establishing a baseline understanding of the APD and AFR recruitment and hiring processes, which will be used to evaluate future progress on their improvement. The Team met with relevant stakeholders, including Aurora’s Civil Service Commissioners and staff, and has identified some preliminary priorities for APD and AFR, including covering staffing shortfalls. The CSC decided to utilize the technical assistance provision of the monitoring agreement to have a member of the Monitor Team serve as an outside expert as required by the Decree.

AFR has, during this Reporting Period, expressed a strong desire, in connection with the Mandates of this section, to conduct a job analysis for each position within the fire department for which it is hiring. The purpose of the analysis would be to validate the relevant skills, knowledge, and qualifications necessary for performance of each position.

The Monitor believes that such a job analysis for both AFR and APD should be conducted. The job analysis would determine whether minimum qualifications for such positions are appropriate as they now exist or whether different qualifications would best serve the City and the goals of the Decree. The Monitor believes that such an analysis should also include an examination of the current workload of officers and fire fighters, leading to the potential to relieve officers and fire fighters from performing tasks that are significantly time consuming, which may be performed by another entity or job position within the department, which would potentially produce better outcomes while at the same time reducing staffing strain on each department and potentially reduce response times to emergent calls.

THIS REPORTING PERIOD’S ASSESSMENTS OF INDIVIDUAL MANDATES IN THE SECTION

During this Reporting Period the Monitor assessed 11 of 17 Mandates in this section as follows:

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 49A

Current Status  - (25-49% Complete. In line with Monitor expectations.)

Mandate 49 at VII A (Page 25) of the Consent Decree, entitled “Recruitment, Hiring, and Promotion – Objectives,” requires that the Monitor determine if the City has transformed recruiting and hiring processes to create a more diverse and qualified workforce and establish APD and AFR’s commitments to a culture of continuous improvement and becoming better police and fire departments.

The text of Mandate reads as follows:

“The City will transform recruiting and hiring processes to create a more diverse and qualified workforce and establish Aurora Police and Aurora Fire Rescue’s commitments to a culture of continuous improvement and becoming better police and fire departments.”

The compliance definition as agreed to in the MADC, necessitates that APD achieve compliance with all 16 different policy driven Mandates related to recruitment and diversity to achieve full compliance with Mandate 49A.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the APD’s status of this Mandate. The Monitor found that Aurora has begun taking preliminary steps toward meeting the Consent Decree’s mandate, including hiring a subject matter expert to assist in complying with the Decree’s requirements on recruitment and hiring. The City has further contracted with Epic Recruiting to create new recruitment materials designed to attract the best candidates for APD positions. AFR has begun reviewing the current state of its recruitment, hiring, and promotion efforts, and that they had met three times with the Commission and AFR during RP1. The Monitor believes this Mandate is on the right track.

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 49B

Current Status  - (25-49% Complete. In line with Monitor expectations.)

Mandate 49 at VII A (Page 25) of the Consent Decree, entitled “Recruitment, Hiring, and Promotion – Objectives,” requires that the Monitor determine if the City has transformed recruiting and hiring processes to create a more diverse and qualified workforce and establish APD and AFR’s commitments to a culture of continuous improvement and becoming better police and fire departments.

The text of Mandate reads as follows:

“The City will transform recruiting and hiring processes to create a more diverse and qualified workforce and establish Aurora Police and Aurora Fire Rescue’s commitments to a culture of continuous improvement and becoming better police and fire departments.”

The compliance definition as agreed to in the MADC, necessitates that AFR achieve compliance with all 16 different policy driven Mandates related to recruitment and diversity to achieve full compliance with Mandate 49A.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the AFR's status of this Mandate. The Monitor found that Aurora has begun taking preliminary steps toward meeting the Consent Decree's mandate, including hiring a subject matter expert to assist in complying with the Decree's requirements on recruitment and hiring. AFR developed a written plan with the objective of creating a more diverse and qualified workforce. AFR has begun reviewing the current state of its recruitment, hiring, and promotion efforts, and that they had met three times with the Commission and APD during RP1. The Monitor believes this Mandate is on the right track.

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 52

Current Status  - (25-49% Complete. In line with Monitor expectations)

Mandate 52 at VII B (Page 26) of the Consent Decree, entitled "Recruitment, Hiring, and Promotion – Recruitment (APD)," requires that the Monitor determine if the APD developed written recruitment plans that include, but are not limited to, these items: clear goals, objectives, and action steps for attracting and retaining a quality work force that better reflects the diversity of the City.

The text of Mandate reads as follows:

"To maintain high-quality service, ensure employee safety and accountability, and promote constitutional, effective policing, Aurora Police and Aurora Fire Rescue will review and revise as necessary recruitment and hiring programs to ensure that Aurora Police and Aurora Fire Rescue successfully attract and hire a diverse group of qualified individuals for their civil service positions[.] Aurora Police and Aurora Fire Rescue will develop written recruitment plans that include, but are not limited to, these items: clear goals, objectives, and action steps for attracting and retaining a quality work force that better reflects the diversity of the City."

The compliance definition as agreed to in the MADC, necessitates that APD develops and documents an approved hiring plan and comprehensive program to achieve compliance with Mandate 52.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the status of this Mandate. The Monitor found that Aurora has begun taking preliminary steps toward meeting the Consent Decree's mandate, including engaging the Monitor as subject matter expert under the technical assistance provision of the Decree, to assist in complying with the Decree's requirements on recruitment and hiring. APD's recruiters have conducted analysis of their past recruitment efforts but definitely need more guidance and clear goals and objectives and actions steps in developing

written recruitment plan based on the 2020 written recruitment plan reviewed by the Monitor. The City has further contracted with Epic Recruiting to create new recruitment materials designed to attract the best candidates for APD positions. AFR reports that it has begun reviewing the current state of its recruitment, hiring, and promotion efforts, and that they met once with the Commission and APD during RP1. The Monitor believes this Mandate is on the right track.

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 53

Current Status  - (25-49% Complete. In line with Monitor expectations.)

Mandate 53 at VII B (Page 26) of the Consent Decree, entitled “Recruitment, Hiring, and Promotion – Recruitment (AFR),” requires that the Monitor determine whether the AFR developed written recruitment plans that include, but are not limited to, these items: clear goals, objectives, and action steps for attracting and retaining a quality work force that better reflects the diversity of the City.

The text of Mandate reads as follows:

“To maintain high-quality service, ensure employee safety and accountability, and promote constitutional, effective policing, Aurora Police and Aurora Fire Rescue will review and revise as necessary recruitment and hiring programs to ensure that Aurora Police and Aurora Fire Rescue successfully attract and hire a diverse group of qualified individuals for their civil service positions[.] Aurora Police and Aurora Fire Rescue will develop written recruitment plans that include, but are not limited to, these items: clear goals, objectives, and action steps for attracting and retaining a quality work force that better reflects the diversity of the City.”

The compliance definition as agreed to in the MADDC, necessitates that AFR develops and documents an approved hiring plan and comprehensive program to achieve compliance with Mandate 53.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the status of this Mandate. The Monitor found that AFR currently employs a full-time recruiter whose responsibilities include implementing recruitment plans and developing strategies for attracting qualified and diverse candidates to the department. The recruiter’s efforts include conducting outreach by attending community events, including cultural events where recruitment efforts can be targeted to underrepresented candidate pools, such as Denver Pride, the Dragon Boat Festival, and Cinco de Mayo. However, the recruiter has been unavailable for the better part of last year due to being on leave and the responsibilities of the recruiter have been dispersed among multiple members of AFR. While the written recruitment plan does provide clear goals and objectives, the written

plan is precipitated on the availability of a full -time recruiter to carry out the action steps. The Monitor will address alternative plans on how to fulfill the responsibilities of the full-time recruiter needs with AFR. The Monitor believes this Mandate is on the right track.

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 54

Current Status  - (25-49% Complete. In line with Monitor expectations.)

Mandate 54 at VII B (1) (Page 26) of the Consent Decree, entitled “Recruitment, Hiring, and Promotion – Recruitment (APD),” requires that the Monitor determine if the APD’s recruitment plan includes a schedule to work with the CSC to review and make any applicable changes to the hiring qualifications.

The text of Mandate reads as follows:

“The recruitment plans should include, at a minimum, the following[:] A schedule to work with the Civil Service Commission to review and make any applicable changes to the minimum qualifications for entry- level police and fire recruits and lateral hires[.]”

The compliance definition as agreed to in the MADC, necessitates that APD develops and documents an approved recruitment plan to achieve compliance with Mandate 54.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the status of this Mandate. The Monitor found that APD have commenced discussions with the Commission and will continue with these discussions in order to both review and make applicable changes to the minimum qualifications for entry level and lateral hires. The Monitor Team is working with APD and CSC to bridge whatever gaps there may be in order to ultimately determine the appropriate minimum qualifications for both entry-level and lateral hires. The Monitor believes this Mandate is on the right track.

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 55

Current Status  - (25-49% Complete. In line with Monitor expectations.)

Mandate 55 at VII B (1) (Page 26) of the Consent Decree, entitled “Recruitment, Hiring, and Promotion – Recruitment (AFR),” requires that the Monitor determine if the AFR’s recruitment plan includes a schedule to work with the CSC to review and make any applicable changes to the hiring qualifications.

The text of Mandate reads as follows:

“The recruitment plans should include, at a minimum, the following[:] A schedule to work with the Civil Service Commission to review and make any applicable changes to the minimum qualifications for entry- level police and fire recruits and lateral hires[.]”

The compliance definition as agreed to in the MADC, necessitates that AFR develops and documents an approved recruitment plan to achieve compliance with Mandate 55.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the status of this Mandate. The Monitor found that AFR’s recruiter, who works under the Community Engagement Manager, who reports to the Fire Chief, currently works collaboratively with staff from the Commission on hiring efforts, including developing hiring solicitations and promotional exams. The Deputy Chief of Professional Development liaises with the Commission and has provided counsel to the Commission on reviewing candidate files. The Deputy Chief’s consultations with the Commission have not included discussions of community demographics, discretionary decision points, or identification of potential bias. However, AFR cites infrequent meetings with the Commission and the lack of a plan for moving forward as potential barriers to future progress. The Monitor Team is working with AFR and CSC to bridge whatever gaps there may be in order to ultimately determine the appropriate minimum qualifications for both entry-level and lateral hires. The Monitor believes this Mandate is on the right track.

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 56

Current Status:  - (0-24% Complete. In line with Monitor expectations.)

Mandate 56 at VII B (2) (Page 26) of the Consent Decree, entitled “Recruitment (Outreach for Diversity) (APD),” requires that the Monitor determine if the APD’s written recruitment plan includes a plan to conduct outreach to many community leaders and stakeholders, aimed at increasing the diversity of each Department’s applicant pool—including race, color, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, national origin, and religion—and identifying recruit and lateral applicants that are committed to community-oriented policing (for police officers) and have the identified skills to succeed in the applicable role.

The text of Mandate reads as follows:

“The recruitment plans should include, at a minimum, the following[:] A plan to conduct outreach to many community leaders and stakeholders, aimed at increasing the diversity of each Department’s applicant pool—including race, color, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, national origin, and religion—and identifying recruit and lateral applicants that are committed to community-

oriented policing (for police officers) and have the identified skills to succeed in the applicable role[.]”

The compliance definition as agreed to in the MADC, necessitates that APD develops and documents an approved outreach plan to achieve compliance with Mandate 56.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the status of this Mandate. The Monitor found that the APD conducts some recruiting within the community under the direction of the Community Relations Section (CRS) of the APD. Recruiting has been a small unit for some time and consists of sworn officers that include: two full time recruiters, an Aurora for Youth lead, one resource for Community Relations and a supervisor serving at the Sergeant level. APD reports that its outreach process is ongoing through job fairs, internship programs, recruiting at military bases and during law enforcement job fairs. While, as noted in other Mandates in this section, there is a lot of work going on, in the area, as of RP1, however, there is no written recruitment plan for 2022 has been made available to the Monitor for evaluation. That being said, the Monitor believes this Mandate is on the right track.

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 57

Current Status:  - (25-49% Complete. In line with Monitor expectations.)

Mandate 57 at VII B (2) (Page 26) of the Consent Decree, entitled “Recruitment (Outreach for Diversity) (AFR),” requires that the Monitor determine if the AFR’s written recruitment plan includes a plan to conduct outreach to many community leaders and stakeholders, aimed at increasing the diversity of each Department’s applicant pool—including race, color, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, national origin, and religion—and identifying recruit and lateral applicants that are committed to community-oriented policing (for police officers) and have the identified skills to succeed in the applicable role.

The text of Mandate reads as follows:

“The recruitment plans should include, at a minimum, the following[:] A plan to conduct outreach to many community leaders and stakeholders, aimed at increasing the diversity of each Department’s applicant pool—including race, color, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, national origin, and religion—and identifying recruit and lateral applicants that are committed to community-oriented policing (for police officers) and have the identified skills to succeed in the applicable role[.]”

The compliance definition as agreed to in the MADC, necessitates that AFR develops and documents an approved recruitment plan to achieve compliance with Mandate 57.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the status of this Mandate. The Monitor found that AFR has a full-time recruiter whose responsibilities include developing recruitment plans for the department and to conduct recruitment-related outreach. AFR strongly believes that the development of any recruitment plan that meets the Consent Decree's requirements must be predicated on the results of a comprehensive job analysis for all AFR personnel ranks so that critical functions and entry-level qualifications can be identified, which will then inform any subsequent recruitment effort. As of RP1, no such analysis has been conducted. AFR has begun implementing new tracking mechanisms to better understand the pool of interested applicants for AFR positions and the communities from which they originate. These tracking mechanisms are intended to help AFR identify areas of success and improvement for its recruitment efforts. AFR reports three target audiences for its current recruitment efforts: ready-to-work applicants, applicants from within Aurora, and applicants whose personal values match AFR's organizational values. For these targeted audiences, AFR deploys targeted recruitment tactics, including paid advertising and social media campaigns, attendance at career fairs, recruitment from colleges and the military, participation in local programs for youth, appearing at high school and middle schools, conducting outreach to Aurora's immigrant communities, and vetting applicants and developing relationships with them through the recruitment process, including through the department's mentorship program for recruits. The written recruitment plan prioritizes increasing diversity in the applicant pool and AFR should be commended for those clearly stated priorities and outreach plans to meet those goals. However, as noted above, as minimum qualifications discussions are ongoing and will be incorporated into the written recruitment plan. The Monitor believes this Mandate is on the right track.

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 58

Current Status:  - (0-24% Complete. In line with Monitor expectations.)

Mandate 58 at VII B (3) (Page 26) of the Consent Decree, entitled "Recruitment, Hiring, and Promotion – Recruitment (APD)," requires that the Monitor determine if the APD's written recruitment plan includes a plan to broadly distribute information about career opportunities, compensation, hiring, the applicable testing process(es), and deadlines and other requirements of each position throughout the Denver metro- area regularly. Determine if the same information is easily available on the City's website and includes the ability for interested persons to directly contact a member of the recruiting team of each Department.

The text of Mandate reads as follows:

“The recruitment plans should include, at a minimum, the following[:] A plan to broadly distribute information about career opportunities, compensation, hiring, the applicable testing process(es), and deadlines and other requirements of each position throughout the Denver metro- area regularly. The same information will be easily available on the City’s website, with the ability for interested persons to directly contact a member of the recruiting team of each Department.”

The compliance definition as agreed to in the MADC, necessitates that APD develops and documents an approved career opportunities distribution plan to achieve compliance with Mandate 58.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the status of this Mandate. The Monitor found that Aurora has begun taking preliminary steps toward meeting the Consent Decree’s mandate, including engaging with the Monitor to provide technical assistance to assist in complying with the Decree’s requirements on recruitment and hiring. The City has further contracted with Epic Recruiting to create new recruitment materials designed to attract the best candidates for APD. The APD’s current recruitment plan covers the period 2020-2021 and the Monitor has not yet been presented with a plan for 2022 for review or assessment. Notwithstanding the fact that no written plan for 2022 has been delivered, the Monitor believes this Mandate is on the right track.

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 59

Current Status:  - (25-49% Complete. In line with Monitor expectations.)

Mandate 59 at VII B (3) (Page 26) of the Consent Decree, entitled “Recruitment, Hiring, and Promotion – Recruitment (AFR),” requires that the Monitor determine if the AFR’s written recruitment plan includes a plan to broadly distribute information about career opportunities, compensation, hiring, the applicable testing process(es), and deadlines and other requirements of each position throughout the Denver metro- area regularly. It further requires the Monitor to determine if the same information is easily available on the City’s website and includes the ability for interested persons to directly contact a member of the recruiting team of each Department.

The text of Mandate reads as follows:

“The recruitment plans should include, at a minimum, the following[:] A plan to broadly distribute information about career opportunities, compensation, hiring, the applicable testing process(es), and deadlines and other requirements of each position throughout the Denver metro- area regularly. The same information will

be easily available on the City’s website, with the ability for interested persons to directly contact a member of the recruiting team of each Department.”

The compliance definition as agreed to in the MADC, necessitates that AFR develops and documents an approved career opportunities distribution plan to achieve compliance with Mandate 59.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the status of this Mandate. The Monitor found that AFR has a full-time recruiter whose responsibilities include developing recruitment plans for the department and to conduct recruitment-related outreach. AFR has begun implementing new tracking mechanisms to better understand the pool of interested applicants for AFR positions and the communities from which they originate. These tracking mechanisms are intended to help AFR identify areas of success and improvement for its recruitment efforts. AFR reports three target audiences for its current recruitment efforts: ready-to-work applicants, applicants from within Aurora, and applicants whose personal values match AFR’s organizational values. For these targeted audiences, AFR deploys targeted recruitment tactics, including paid advertising and social media campaigns, attendance at career fairs, recruitment from colleges and the military, participation in local programs for youth, appearing at high school and middle schools, conducting outreach to Aurora’s immigrant communities, and vetting applicants and developing relationships with them through the recruitment process, including through the department’s mentorship program for recruits. However, as noted above, the unavailability of a full-time recruiter brings into question the viability of such plan and need to be discussed with AFR. Notwithstanding these issues, the Monitor believes this Mandate is on the right track.

ASSESSMENT OF MANDATE 65

Current Status: ● - (Substantial Compliance)

Mandate 65 at VII C (4) (Page 29) of the Consent Decree, entitled “Recruitment, Hiring, and Promotion - Civil Service Commission (Outside Expert),” requires that the Monitor determine if the City and/or the CSC select and hire an outside expert with expertise in best practices for recruiting and hiring a qualified and diverse public safety workforce of police officers and firefighters within the framework of the authority of the CSC provided by the Charter in consultation with the Consent Decree Monitor and by the CSC Outside Expert Retention Deadline.

The text of Mandate reads as follows:

“The City or the Civil Service Commission, in consultation with the Consent Decree Monitor, will select and hire an outside expert with expertise in best practices for recruiting and hiring a qualified and diverse public safety workforce of police officers and firefighters within the framework of the authority of the Commission provided by the Charter. This outside expert shall be retained by the Civil Service Commission Outside Expert Retention Deadline.”

The compliance definition as agreed to in the MADC, necessitates that CSC hires an approved subject matter expert consultant for technical assistance to achieve compliance with Mandate 65.

During the current reporting period the Monitor assessed the status of this Mandate. The Monitor found that the City of Aurora met the requirements of this mandate, engaging the Monitor Team as the subject matter expert who will work with APD, AFR and CSC in establishing best practices for recruiting and hiring a qualified and diverse public safety workforce. The selection of the Monitor Team to serve in this function was approved by the Commission in March 2022. As such, the Monitor finds the City in full compliance with this provision.

ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY

INTRODUCTION

Institutional accountability and transparency are indispensable in any organization that strives for legitimacy. Police departments are frequently at the center of public calls for accountability and transparency both because of the unique authority bestowed upon them under the law and because of their mission to use their authority on behalf of the communities they serve. Without accountability and transparency, communities and police departments alike are impaired in their ability to evaluate the alignment between each other’s interests and expectations. To the extent that legitimacy is highest when this alignment is congruous, it should be in the best interest of any department to hold itself accountable to, and to be transparent with, its community constituency. Further, the most legitimate departments recognize that “accountability” and “transparency” are not simply singular goals to be achieved but are rather components of an institutional ethos that informs departmental policy and administration. To this end, the most accountable and transparent departments—and by extension the most legitimate—are those whose accountability and transparency policies and practices are motivated by an ethic of continuous institutional improvement in pursuit of those ideals. Demonstrations of this ethic include implementing the accountability mechanisms discussed in *Systems to Ensure Best Policing Practices* above, including enhanced supervision and early intervention programs that

monitor agency personnel for behavioral signs that could indicate the potential for future misconduct, allowing for remedial interventions before misconduct manifests. Successful implementation of these interventions can increase both accountability and transparency by acknowledging the potential and predictability of adverse officer conduct and by improving how agencies respond to the risk of such conduct, minimizing its likelihood.

HISTORY AND BASIS FOR CONSENT DECREE MANDATES

The Colorado Attorney General's Office September 15th, 2021, report noted four potential accountability mechanisms for police departments: internal discipline, lawsuits, community feedback, and external oversight. In each of these areas, the report noted significant room for improvement within the APD and the City more broadly. For example, the report noted that APD maintained aggregate data in a way that made it difficult to appreciate the scope or scale of alleged misconduct by APD officers, with cases being tracked but not the number of allegations within those cases. This finding tracked closely with community feedback gathered by Aurora residents, who, according to the report, "expressed a desire to have more information about critical incidents promptly disclosed," with many feeling that APD's investigations and reviews are "largely hidden from the public." Even the Attorney General's own investigators expressed difficulties in being able to assess the scope of misconduct among APD's officers, with the report claiming that the investigators could not determine how many APD officers within a given sample were disciplined after undergoing the department's disciplinary process. Further, the report noted that civil liability against individual officers has not been an effective accountability measure since the APD and the City have failed to provide direct feedback to officers whose conduct resulted in legal liability for the City. Data concerning legal liability, for example, is not tracked within an early warning database that could flag potential interventions to ensure officers conduct themselves lawfully and appropriately. The Decree aims to improve on current practices to maximize accountability and transparency both internally within departmental stakeholders and externally with APD's service community. Among its goals is to track officers' disciplinary outcomes, identify trends and patterns of misconduct, and improve APD's public reporting.

CONSENT DECREE OBJECTIVES

The Consent Decree seeks the development of systems for APD to regularly and easily identify trends and patterns in the conduct of its officers for use in decision making and for transparency to the public.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Although not directly required by this section of the Decree, the Monitor will be working with each department to ensure that all appropriate systems of accountability, including those outlined in Systems to Ensure Best-Practice Policing, above, are implemented.

TRAINING IMPLICATIONS

To the extent that training on the use of these systems is required, the Monitor will be working with each Department to help develop those systems.

OPERATIONAL INTEGRITY IMPLICATIONS

The Monitoring Team will review the efficacy of the system for APD to identify trends and patterns in the conduct of its officer and the role this information plays in decision-making as well as how this information is transparently shared with the public.

DATA UTILIZATION

The Monitoring Team needs to determine which data does and does not exist and will then work with each department to ensure that such data is being utilized most effectively.

PROGRESS AND NOTABLE OBSERVATIONS FROM THIS REPORTING PERIOD

The Monitoring Team reviewed APD's Personnel Early Intervention System ("PEIS") and met with the system's administrators. The Team also reviewed APD's PEIS policy and the department's baseline collection of PEIS data.

THIS REPORTING PERIOD'S ASSESSMENTS OF INDIVIDUAL MANDATES IN THE SECTION

During this Reporting Period neither of the two Mandates were assessed in this section. Assessments of individual Mandates in the section will commence next reporting period.

UPCOMING ACTIVITIES

During the upcoming reporting period the Monitor will be hosting the second Town Hall scheduled for August 9, 2022 at 7 PM. The Monitor will be working with the CSC and continuing its assessments of the various Mandates. In addition, the Monitor will be providing technical assistance in the areas of Stops; Use of Force; and Recruitment, Hiring and Promotion.

CONCLUSION

The first reporting period of monitoring activity has been marked by noteworthy cooperation and apparent good will of all of the parties and stakeholders in the process. While there are a few areas of significant concern, the Monitor believes there is genuine interest of the parties in achieving the goals of the Consent Decree and effectuating its provisions as quickly as possible so as to allow the reforms to be felt on the streets of Aurora. Over the next reporting period the Monitor will continue to familiarize itself with the City and will assess various mandates of the Decree.

APPENDIX A – REPORT CARD

Attached hereto.

APPENDIX B – THE MONITORING TEAM BIOS

Attached hereto.

APPENDIX C – COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCIL BIOS

Attached hereto.

APPENDIX D – THE CONSENT DECREE

Attached hereto.

APPENDIX E - METHODOLOGIES TO AID IN THE DETERMINATION OF COMPLIANCE (MADC)

Attached hereto.

APPENDIX F - INTERIM REPORT TO THE PARTIES

Attached hereto.

APPENDIX G – SURVEY RESULTS

Attached hereto.

APPENDIX A

REPORT CARD

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY												
67	Accountability and Transparency - Objectives: The City will develop systems that regularly and easily identify trends and patterns in the conduct of its officers with the ability to track conduct by officer, supervisor, shift, beat and district											
68	Accountability and Transparency - Goals and Measurements: With the Monitor and outside expert develop a system that tracks disciplinary outcomes, identification of trends or patterns of sustained complaints, and public reporting of data collection											

<u>LEGEND</u>	ESTIMATED 0-24% COMPLETE	ESTIMATED 25-49% COMPLETE	ESTIMATED 50-74% COMPLETE	ESTIMATED 75-99% COMPLETE	SUBSTANTIAL COMPLIANCE
RIGHT TRACK (IN LINE WITH MONITOR EXPECTATIONS)					
CAUTIONARY TRACK (AT THIS TIME UNCERTAIN IF MONITOR'S EXPECTATIONS WILL BE MET)					
WRONG TRACK OR UNACCEPTABLY OVERDUE (EXPECTATIONS OF MONITOR ARE NOT BEING MET)					
NOT EVALUATED IN THE INDICATED REPORTING PERIOD	[CELL IN CURRENT OR PAST REPORTING PERIODS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]				
TO BE EVALUATED IN THE NEXT REPORTING PERIOD					

APPENDIX B

THE MONITORING TEAM BIOS

Jeff Schlanger (Consent Decree Monitor) is the founder, and CEO of IntegrAssure, Inc. and is a leading authority on institutional change management with more than four decades of experience at the highest levels of law, law enforcement, independent investigations, and monitorships. Mr. Schlanger, who began his career as a prosecutor in the Manhattan DA's Office, served almost nine years as the Primary Deputy Monitor for the LAPD Monitorship. During that same time period, Mr. Schlanger performed a number of significant independent investigations at the request of large police departments throughout the country, including the Tennessee Highway Patrol (an investigation into corruption in the hiring and promotion process), the San Francisco Police Department (an investigation into an internal affairs investigation probe involving the son of a Chief in the Department), and the Austin Police Department (investigative reviews of two separate fatal officer-involved shootings). He also served on the Executive Committee of the Working Group for National Guidelines for Monitors, which developed the National Guidelines for Police Monitors. In 2014, Mr. Schlanger left the private sector, to re-join the public sector as the Chief of Staff to Manhattan District Attorney Cyrus Vance. In 2015, Mr. Schlanger returned to the private sector and in 2016, assembled and led a team of policing professionals, to review and ultimately monitor UCPD. In 2018, Mr. Schlanger joined the NYPD as Counsel to the Police Commissioner, and then was asked to take on the position of the first ever Deputy Commissioner for Risk Management. This position was the "tip of the spear" in terms of Department improvement efforts. Mr. Schlanger pioneered a true risk management and continuous improvement approach to police re-engineering, re-imagination, and reform, and served in this capacity until March 19, 2021, helping to guide the Department through its most tumultuous period, implementing reforms brought about by both the federal monitorship arising out of stop and frisk abuses and the tragic murder of George Floyd. He served on the NYPD's Discipline Committee, its Force Review Board and established and chaired the Use of Force and Tactics Workgroup.

Erin Pilnyak (Deputy Monitor) has served in a variety of public sector positions overseeing projects and driving results in each. Ms. Pilnyak began her career at the Manhattan District Attorney's Office (DANY), where she spent 10 years and was a member of the Sex Crimes and Crime Strategies Unit among other units. After DANY, she served as the Deputy Director of Crime Strategies at the New York City Mayor's Office of Criminal Justice (MOCJ) where she oversaw all criminal justice strategies in New York City and devised and implemented criminal justice reform initiatives for the City. During her tenure, she worked closely with senior leadership for the New York State court system, public defenders, prosecutors, NYPD, Department of Correction, other law enforcement partners, elected officials, and community groups to implement major criminal justice reform efforts, such as significant changes to the juvenile justice system, lightening the touch of low-level enforcement, and community-based solutions to reframe the concept of public safety. Ms. Pilnyak left MOCJ to join NYPD where she served in the two-star position of Assistant Deputy Commissioner at the Risk Management Bureau. She worked on developing policies and programs to guide the Department on implementing reforms and running the day-to-day operations of the approximately 200-person Bureau.

Robin S. Engel, Ph.D. (Team Lead on Addressing Racial Bias in Policing) is a Professor of Criminal Justice at the University of Cincinnati (UC) and Director of the International Association of Chiefs of Police / UC Center for Police Research and Policy. From 2016-2019, she served as UC's Vice President for Safety and Reform where her administrative duties included oversight of the daily operations and implementation of comprehensive reform efforts of UCPD in the aftermath of a critical incident involving the fatal police shooting of an unarmed motorist. She is a nationally recognized expert in policing research in use of force and reduction of harm to communities by making police-citizen encounters safer with a focus on addressing racial disparities. Dr. Engel engages in police research and evaluation, with expertise in empirical assessments of police behavior, police-community relations, and crime reduction strategies. She has served as Principal Investigator for over eighty research grants, totaling over \$24 million dollars, and has published over 60 research articles, books, and chapters, along with dozens of technical reports for practitioners. She has been consistently ranked among the top academics, and the number one female in the field of criminal justice/criminology based on publications in prestigious peer-reviewed journals. Her work on community violence reduction resulted in several prominent team awards, including the 2008 IACP/Motorola Webber Seavey Award for Excellence in Law Enforcement, the 2009 IACP/West Award for Excellence in Criminal Investigations, and the 2008 National Criminal Justice Association's Outstanding Criminal Justice Program Award. She has served as an expert on policing and violence reduction for panels convened at the White House and 10 Downing Street. In 2017, Dr. Engel was awarded the Distinguished Alumni Award from the School of Criminal Justice at the University of Albany. She currently serves as a governor-appointed member of the Ohio Collaborative Community-Police Advisory Board, and as the co-chair of IACP's Research Advisory Committee. She has served as a consultant to several Colorado police departments on a variety of policing issues, is a consultant on police training for the Ohio Attorney General and serves as a member of the National Police Foundation's Council on Policing Reforms and Race.

John R. "Rick" Brown (Team Lead on Use of Force) retired at the rank of Lt. Colonel after completing more than 29 years of service with the Pennsylvania State Police. Upon his retirement, Mr. Brown served as a member of the federal Independent Monitoring Teams for the City of Oakland Police Department, Maricopa County Sheriff's Office (Arizona), Detroit Police Department, and served on the Monitoring Team for the Niagara Falls Police Department Consent Decree brought by the State of New York. He was also a member of the U.S. Department of Justice team that conducted the pattern and practice investigation of the Baltimore Police Department and served as a technical advisor on accountability processes for the Puerto Rico Police Department. Mr. Brown has been certified as an Expert Witness evaluating police use of force in the federal court system. As the former Deputy Commissioner of Professional Responsibility for the Pennsylvania State Police, he specialized in citizen's complaints, internal investigations, discipline, diversity issues, and community trust building. He has investigated Discrimination and Racism in the Austin (TX) Police Department and is currently working with the Colorado Springs Police Department on Use of Force Assessments. Mr. Brown assessed Anchorage Police Department (AK) regarding their policies and procedures to mitigate sexual misconduct with the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) and served with the Office for Justice Programs (OJP) Diagnostic Center as a subject matter

expert on the Metro East Police District Commission (MEPDC), East St. Louis, IL; Hartford Police Department, Hartford, CT; and Springettsbury Township Police Department, York County, PA projects. Mr. Brown served as a subject matter expert and a Team Leader on Homicide Operations Assessment for the New Orleans Police Department. Mr. Brown is the Chairman of the Policing Subject Matter Expert group in American University's "And Justice for All Symposium Series" regarding Criminal Justice Reform in Washington, DC.

Jane Perlov (Team Lead on Documentation of Stops) is a law enforcement professional with over three decades of experience. She started her career at NYPD and was the commanding officer of multiple precincts and retired as a Deputy Chief. She was the first woman to command an entire borough of detectives when she became the Commanding Officer of Detective Borough Queens. She retired from the NYPD to serve as the Secretary of Public Safety for the State of Massachusetts where she was responsible for meeting all emergency management, criminal justice, law enforcement, and correctional needs of the Commonwealth. She managed policy and fiscal oversight of 21 state agencies (including state police, fire services, corrections, the National Guard, and Emergency Management Agency), boards and commissions, encompassing more than 10,000 employees with a budget of more than \$1 billion. In her role, she chaired the Governor's Advisory Council on Youth Violence, Criminal History Systems Board, Criminal Justice Training Council, and the Governor's Task Force on Hate Crimes and implemented the legislation providing a model policy on racial and gender profiling for all police agencies in Massachusetts. In September 2001, Ms. Perlov was selected to serve as the Chief of Police for Raleigh, North Carolina, where she oversaw 746 sworn officers until her retirement in March of 2007. Under her leadership, she reduced crime across the city by 22% in a city that experienced exponential growth during the same period. Her other notable accomplishments include reducing vacancies of more than 70 sworn staff to less than 20 through aggressive recruiting while prioritizing diversifying the department; employing a Grants Manager to identify alternate funding sources to expand the ability of the department to serve the community; and creating a Strategic Management Team to focus on problem-oriented policing. She is currently serving as a member of the NYPD Federal Monitor Team where she conducts live audits of the academy, in-service and promotional training, oversees implementation of new policies, procedures, and trainings to bring the department into compliance with court ordered reforms, participates in community and police focus groups, and conducts in depth document reviews of "stop, question and frisk" reports and investigations into allegations of racial profiling investigations.

Edward J. Dadosky (Team Lead on Use of Ketamine and Other Chemical Sedatives as Chemical Restraint) is currently serving in his sixth year as Director of Emergency Management, Business Continuity Planning, and Fire Safety Inspection at the University of Cincinnati. His duties include university-wide strategic planning in the aforementioned areas for 5 campuses, 14 colleges, 47,000 students, and 15,000 faculty/staff. Before coming to UC, he served for over 31 years on the Cincinnati Fire Department. From 1984-1999, he worked as a firefighter/medic in many Cincinnati neighborhoods including Oakley, Bond Hill, Camp Washington, and Corryville. He retired as an Assistant Fire Chief having been responsible for many areas including Emergency Management, Special Events, Homeland Security Grants Management, Environmental Crimes, Fire

Investigations Unit, Training/Education Bureau, and Continuity of Operations Planning. He attended the Cincinnati Police Academy in 2001 to obtain an Ohio Peace Officer Commission which is a department requirement to lead the Fire Investigative and Environmental Crimes Units. He maintains commission/certification with the State of Ohio as Police Officer, Firefighter, Fire Inspector, and Paramedic. He was appointed in 2021 by Ohio Governor Mike DeWine to an Environmental Advocacy Chair on the State Emergency Response Commission (SERC).

Cassandra “Cassi” Chandler (Team Lead on Recruitment, Hiring, and Promotion) has led a distinguished career in both law enforcement and banking as a leader, an intelligence strategist, and an investigator. Ms. Chandler spent 23 years with the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), where she directed criminal and domestic terrorism intelligence, white collar crimes, financial crimes, and cybercrime and foreign intelligence activity investigations. She led the FBI’s training division, redesigned the Bureau’s health care fraud and criminal intelligence programs, and was appointed to the U.S. Senior Executive Service as an Assistant Director. She retired as Special Agent in Charge of the Norfolk, Virginia FBI Field Office. She then joined Bank of America where she was responsible for building an integrated framework to identify, evaluate and assess emerging regulatory risks and the operational effectiveness of enterprise coverage areas. She also served as a member of the NYPD Federal Monitor Team. She is currently President and CEO of Vigeo Alliance, which partners with businesses to grow emerging leaders, retain diverse talent, and build a culture of leadership in an inclusive organization. She is the recipient of numerous awards, including the Senior Executive Service Presidential Rank Award of Meritorious Executive under President George W. Bush, the National Center for Women & Policing’s “Breaking the Glass Ceiling” award, and the Norfolk NAACP Trailblazer Award.

Denise Lewis (Team Lead on Accountability and Transparency) has spent over 30 years developing and honing her expertise in the areas of law enforcement, internal and external investigations of police agencies, and most notably, the independent monitoring of police organizations. She held a variety of patrol and supervisory assignments conducting both criminal and internal investigations before retiring from LAPD. Since retiring from LAPD, Ms. Lewis was a member of the Independent Monitoring team of the Detroit Police Department (DPD) where she provided DPD with the Technical Assistance to stand up their internal audit unit. In addition to training the DPD audit staff, Ms. Lewis also conducted compliance assessments of DPD’s various reform efforts including best practices and applicable standards for investigations, uses of force, training, holding cell facilities, and assessment of the audits completed by DPD. Ms. Lewis has also assisted numerous police departments, including the Los Angeles Airport Police Department and the San Jose Police Departments in establishing and institutionalizing the internal audit function, including the development of the requisite audit protocols, policies, procedures to help manage the many risks associated with law enforcement activities. In addition, she has provided training to police departments on the evaluation of policies and procedures related to use of force, arrest, and detention. Most recently, Ms. Lewis served as Deputy Monitor of the University of Cincinnati’s Police Department (UCPD) during its

voluntary monitorship that resulted from a fatal officer involved shooting. Following that event, the UCPD underwent a comprehensive review and subsequently agreed to implement 276 recommendations over a three-year period.

John Thomas (Community Liaison) is a law enforcement professional with almost 40 years of experience in both urban and university policing. He recently retired as the Executive Director/Chief of the University of Southern California's Department of Public Safety ("DPS") overseeing approximately 300 sworn and civilian employees. When Chief Thomas arrived at USC he established Compstat and has run it every week since 2013. DPS's Compstat was established to analyze operational efficiency and efficacy on a weekly basis utilizing data points on crime, quality of life, and community engagement. Most notably, Compstat is open to the public and to relevant stakeholders, such as Los Angeles City Attorneys, LAPD, Los Angeles Fire Department, community interventionists, homeless advocates, and student groups. Before leading DPS, Chief Thomas spent 21 years as a member of LAPD, where he retired at the rank of Lieutenant after serving four LAPD Police Chiefs as their Adjutant. As a member of LAPD, Chief Thomas worked patrol assignments primarily in South Los Angeles in Wilshire, 77th Street, Southwest, Newton Street, and Pacific Divisions, and was assigned to the Department's Gang Enforcement Detail in South Los Angeles where he worked in an undercover capacity. Chief Thomas was awarded the City of Los Angeles' City Angel Award for outstanding community enhancement and the Department's Meritorious Unit Citation. Chief Thomas has been on the Board of Directors for The Challenger's Boys & Girls Club in South LA and has been on the Board of Directors for Los Angeles Police Historical Society since 1999. He has researched and written extensively on the Early Black History of LAPD and Los Angeles. He serves on the Board of Directors for the Police Officers' Association of Los Angeles County (POALAC) and on the Board of Advisors for the University of Southern California (USC) Price School's Safe Communities Institute. He is a member of the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators, the Police Executive Research Forum, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives, Pac 12 Campus Chiefs' Association, Campus Safety Magazine Advisory Board, California College & University Police Chiefs Association, and the FBI National Academy Associates.

Jorge X. Camacho (Chief Writer) is a Clinical Lecturer in Law and Associate Research Scholar at Yale Law School and serves as the Policing, Law, and Policy Director of the Justice Collaboratory at Yale Law School. His work at Yale primarily focuses on policing and public safety policy locally and nationally. Prior to joining Yale, Camacho served as a law and policy advisor at the New York City Mayor's Office of Criminal Justice and at the New York City Office of the Corporation Counsel. He started his career as an Assistant District Attorney at the Manhattan District Attorney's Office and has served on multiple government task forces and committees throughout his years in government service, including serving on the Steering Committee of the New York City Mayor's Task Force on Cannabis Legalization and chairing its Subcommittee on Law Enforcement and Social Justice.

Brandon del Pozo (Monitor Team Advisor) is presently a postdoctoral researcher in substance use and drug policy at The Miriam Hospital and the Warren Alpert Medical School of Brown University and serves on the Federal Consent Decree Monitoring Team for the Newark, New Jersey Police Department, leading efforts on equity and supervision of that Consent Decree. His research is largely rooted in cutting-edge reforms he implemented while he served as the Chief of Burlington (Vermont) Police Department from 2015-2019. As the Chief of Burlington Police Department, he assumed a leadership role in addressing opioid addiction as a public health crisis with important opportunities for intervention by the police officers, which contributed to a 50% decrease in opioid overdose deaths (2017–2018) in a state that saw a 20% increase elsewhere. As part of his innovative approach in addressing the opioid crisis, he created and led the city's multidisciplinary "CommunityStat" approach to the opioid crisis, a model that was shared with many jurisdictions across the country during the opioid crisis. He also designed, procured, and deployed the first Emergency Response Vehicle in Vermont, allowing trained officers to isolate, contain, and de-escalate violent and distressed suspects. He increased inventory of team-based less-than-lethal equipment deployed to the field and implemented a co-response team where police were assisted by a Street Outreach Team of mental health professionals when responding to crisis calls to de-escalate encounters and refer patients to the appropriate services.

APPENDIX C
COMMUNITY
ADVISORY
COUNCIL BIOS

COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCIL CO-CHAIRS

Reid Hettich

Reid Hettich has been an Aurora resident since 1985. He has been the Pastor of two congregations in Aurora and currently serves as Lead Pastor of Mosaic Church of Aurora, a multicultural church in North Aurora. He has been the Chair of the Aurora Community of Faith, the Aurora Strong Resilience Center, Aurora Community Connections and the Aurora Economic Opportunity Center. Currently, he is the Chair of Aurora's Key Community Response Team, a member of the Community Policing Advisory Team, and sits on other nonprofit boards. He is a husband, father, grandfather, and a Broncos fan.

Omar Montgomery

Omar Montgomery has been a resident of Aurora for 20 years. He currently serves as the Director of Equity, Culture, and Community Engagement for Cherry Creek School District and is an adjunct instructor for the University of Colorado Denver. Mr. Montgomery serves as president of the Aurora Branch of the NAACP. He also serves on the Aurora Police Department's Citizens' Advisory Board and Key Community Response Team, a committee designed to improve law enforcement's relationships with underserved communities. He also serves as board chairperson at the Village Exchange Center—a "one stop shop" supporting integration, engagement and empowerment of Aurora's immigrants and refugee communities. He is a father, family man, and proud companion to his dog, Marley.

Jeanette Rodriguez

Jeanette Rodriguez immigrated to America over 30 years ago from South America and has been an Aurora resident since 2003. She is a former educator at Jefferson County Schools, a real estate agent, an auto repair shop owner, a sheriff's deputy, and a pastor. She is a wife and mother of two grown children. Over the last two decades, she has served her community in several ministerial and volunteer capacities including, among others, as co-chair of the Aurora Immigrant and Refugee Commission, and member of the Community Policing Advisory team.

COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBERS

Maurice Anderson

Maurice Anderson is originally from Huntsville, Alabama but has been a resident of Aurora since 2011. He retired from the Air Force after more than 22 years of active-duty service and 8-1/2 years in the Army National Guard. During his career in the Air Force, he specialized in mental health, substance abuse, PTSD, traumatic stress response, suicide prevention, and family

advocacy/counseling/awareness prevention services. After his retirement, he interned at the Veterans Administration as a social worker in the homeless programs and worked as a federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Investigator for four years. He is a husband and father two young adult children.

Melissa Berglund

Melissa Berglund has been a resident of Aurora since 1979. She has twenty years of local, state and national child welfare experience in a variety of roles from residential treatment, direct practice, to training, coaching and prevention. She has spent the past ten years building community change in child welfare including collaboration with early childhood and behavioral health programs.

Maisha Fields

Maisha Fields moved back to Aurora in 2010 from Los Angeles. She started her career as an intensive care nurse in Los Angeles. She currently serves as the executive director of the Fields Foundation, a non-profit in Aurora established after the horrific murders of Javad Marshall Fields and Vivian Wolfe, Maisha's brother and his fiancée. Fields Foundation provides children a healthy, fair, and safe head start in life towards a successful passage to adulthood.

Ronald Garcia y Ortiz

Ronald Garcia y Ortiz is a Colorado native and has been an Aurora resident for over twenty years. He is a career-long educator in the Cherry Creek School District and currently serves as the Director of Equity, Culture, and Community Engagement. He previously served in multiple roles during his career, including as a social studies teacher, coach, dean of students, athletic director, assistant principal, and a principal.

Willian Gondrez

William Gondrez has been a resident of Aurora since 1992. He served over 20 years in the U.S. Army, retiring at Fitzsimons Army Medical Center. He currently serves as a board member for the city's Citizen's Water Advisory Committee. In addition, through the Spirit of Aurora he assists the city's finance department with 501(C)(3) grants and projects. Mr. Gondrez is the President of the oldest community organization in this city, Northwest Aurora Neighborhood Organization and is currently employed with the Aurora Public Schools as an Early Childhood educator.

Becky Hogan

Becky Hogan has been an Aurora resident and an active community volunteer for 19 years. She was a small business owner in Aurora with a background in economic development and land development consulting. She is currently serving as a Second Vice Chair of the Aurora Planning Commission.

Gianina Horton

Gianina Horton has been a resident of Aurora for a year. She has worked in civilian oversight of law enforcement for several years. Currently, she serves as the Executive Director of a nonprofit called the Denver Justice Project, which works with historically marginalized communities to address systemic racism by transforming law enforcement and the structure of the criminal justice system through intersectional movement building, direct action, advocacy, and collaborative education.

Thomas Mayes

Thomas Mayes is a Colorado native and has been a resident of Aurora for 38 years. He is a Vietnam veteran with 23 years of government service and served 32 years as a senior pastor in Aurora. He has been serving the Aurora community since 1990.

Amy Wiles

Amy Wiles has been a resident of Aurora for 22 years. She currently serves as the Director of Strategy and Business Development for United HealthCare where she works on nationwide change management programs, strategic and complex project roll out while maintaining the goal of representing the voice of the customers. She is a mother to two sons and volunteers at a variety of local events and causes, including the Special Olympics.

APPENDIX D

CONSENT DECREE

DISTRICT COURT, ARAPAHOE COUNTY, COLORADO 7325 S Potomac Street #100 Centennial, Colorado 80112 STATE OF COLORADO, ex rel. PHILIP J. WEISER, ATTORNEY GENERAL, Plaintiff, v. CITY OF AURORA, COLORADO, Defendant.	^ COURT USE ONLY ^
	Case No. _____ Div. [____] Ctrm. [____]
JOINT MOTION TO ENTER JUDGMENT OF STIPULATED CONSENT DECREE AND JUDGMENT UNDER C.R.S. § 24-31-113	

1. The City of Aurora and the Attorney General have reached an agreement on how Aurora will address issues identified in the September 15, 2021, Report “Investigation of the Aurora Police Department and Aurora Fire Rescue.” The attached Consent Decree & Judgment sets forth the specific commitments that Aurora, including the Aurora Police Department, the Aurora Fire Rescue, and the Aurora Civil Service Commission, will take with the support of an Independent Consent Decree Monitor to improve and comply with state and federal law.

2. These changes build on the recent efforts that Aurora has taken and include using outside experts to improve Aurora's use-of-force policies and training on compliance with those policies, creating specific guidance on critical decision-making and the exercise of discretion when engaging with community members to address perceived or actual bias in policing, developing a new system to collect data about police interactions with members of the community, and improving the hiring of police officers and firefighters to ensure a qualified public safety workforce that better reflects Aurora's diversity. The Independent Consent Decree Monitor will provide regular public updates to this Court and work with Aurora to ensure these changes reflect best practices and community input. The parties expect this Consent Decree to last approximately five years, with the exact term determined by how long Aurora takes to implement the changes and when Aurora reaches substantial compliance with the requirements of this Consent Decree.

3. Plaintiff, the People of the State of Colorado, by and through its attorney, Philip J. Weiser, Attorney General of the State of Colorado, and Defendant City of Aurora, Colorado, file this Joint Motion for the Court to enter a judgment of the attached Stipulated Consent Decree.

4. The Court has jurisdiction of this subject matter under C.R.S. § 24-31-113.

5. The State of Colorado initiated this suit by filing a Complaint. The City denies the claims in the Complaint and does not admit liability for any of the allegations made in the Complaint. However, because the City is committed to continuous improvement in the delivery of public safety services, and to avoid protracted and expensive litigation, the City negotiated with the Attorney General to develop this Consent Decree that the Parties believe is fair, reasonable, and in the public interest.

6. The parties jointly represent that they have diligently worked cooperatively to agree to the attached Stipulated Consent Decree and confirm to the Court that the Stipulated Consent Decree incorporates and resolves all possible violations by the City, whether or not referenced in the Stipulated Consent Decree, up to the effective date of the Stipulated Consent Decree.

7. The parties consent to the entry of Judgment outlined in the attached Stipulated Consent Decree without adjudication of any fact discussed, recognizing that the Judgment does not contain any admission of wrongdoing or liability about allegations of violations that occurred before the entry of this Decree and Judgment by Defendant.

8. The individuals signing below represent that the parties have authorized them to affirm entry of the Judgment outlined in the attached Consent Decree.

9. The parties request that the Court enter the attached Stipulated Consent Decree & Judgment as a Judgment of the Court, for the City and its Departments and Commissions to be legally bound.

AGREED AS TO FORM & SUBSTANCE:

The State of Colorado ex rel. Philip J. Weiser, Colorado Attorney General, *Plaintiff*

DATE: _____

ERIC R. OLSON

Solicitor General
Colo. Reg. No. 36414

JANET DRAKE

Deputy Attorney, Criminal Justice
Colo. Reg. No. 27697

ALEXA JONES

Special Counsel for Civil Rights
Colo. Reg. No. 51460

Ralph L. Carr Colorado Judicial Center
1300 Broadway, 10th Floor
Denver, CO 80203
Telephone: 720-508-6000
E-Mail: eric.olson@coag.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff, the State of Colorado

City of Aurora, Colorado, *Defendant*

TROY A. EID

Colo. Reg. No. 21164

MATTHEW K. TIESLAU

Colo. Reg. No. 47483

GREENBERG TRAURIG LLP

1144 15th Street Suite 3300

Denver, Colorado 80202

Telephone: (303) 572-6521

E-Mail: eidt@gtlaw.com

Counsel for the City of Aurora*

(*to be designated as attorneys of record
for the City of Aurora in the Colorado
case management system)

DANIEL L. BROTZMAN

Colo. Reg. No. 15919

Aurora, Colorado City Attorney

JULIE A. HECKMAN

Colo. Reg. No. 21872

Deputy City Attorney

PETER A. SCHULTE

Colo. Reg. No. 43133

Public Safety Client Group Manager

CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

15151 E Alameda Pkwy Ste 5300

Aurora, Colorado 80012

Telephone: (303) 739-7030

E-mail: pschulte@auroragov.org

Attorneys for Defendant, City of Aurora,
Colorado

EXHIBIT

1

DISTRICT COURT, ARAPAHOE COUNTY, COLORADO 7325 S Potomac Street #100 Centennial, Colorado 80112 STATE OF COLORADO, ex rel. PHILIP J. WEISER, ATTORNEY GENERAL, Plaintiff, v. CITY OF AURORA, COLORADO, Defendant.	▲ COURT USE ONLY ▲
	Case No. _____ Div. [____] Ctrm. [____]
STIPULATED CONSENT DECREE & JUDGMENT	

The State of Colorado filed a Complaint on _____, 2021, and Defendant, the City of Aurora, Colorado, including the Aurora Police Department, Aurora Fire Rescue, and Aurora Civil Service Commission consent to the entry of this Stipulated Consent Decree and Judgment without it constituting any evidence against or admission by any party on any issue of fact or law.

The parties agree to be bound by the provisions of this Stipulated Consent Decree and Judgment, pending approval by the Court, and that the Stipulated

Consent Decree and Judgment will have an effective date of the day it is entered by the Court.

The purpose of this Consent Decree and Judgment is to ensure that the City, including all of its departments and commissions, addresses issues identified in the September 15, 2021, Report titled “Investigation of the Aurora Police Department and Aurora Fire Rescue.”

Without adjudication of any issue of fact or law, and with the consent of the Parties, the Court orders as follows:

I. JURISDICTION AND OTHER LAW

This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter and the parties. The Complaint states a claim upon which relief may be granted against Defendant under C.R.S. § 24-31-113, and venue is proper under C.R.C.P. 98(c)(1). Defendant waives any objection to jurisdiction in this Court and agrees it will not challenge or dispute jurisdiction of this Court or bring any action related to this Consent Decree in any other court.

Nothing in this Consent Decree will be construed to encourage or authorize any Party or the Independent Consent Decree Monitor, referred to here as a Consent Decree Monitor or Monitor, to violate any state or federal law, including the City of Aurora's Charter.

II. POLICIES AND TRAINING GENERALLY

Aurora Fire Rescue and Aurora Police agree to develop comprehensive policies and procedures that ensure implementation of this Consent Decree. In addition, Aurora Fire Rescue and Aurora Police will work to ensure policies are consistent and complementary, conduct training to ensure coordinated responses, and hold officers and firefighters accountable for violating policy.

A. Policy Development, Review, and Implementation

Aurora will work with the Independent Consent Decree Monitor to evaluate the development, review, and implementation processes for Aurora's policies, procedures, and rules outlined in this Consent Decree. The parties agree that Aurora must develop procedures that speed up the policy development, review, and implementation process.

During the time covered by the Consent Decree, Aurora will submit any new or revised policies, procedures, or rules outlined in this Consent Decree to the Consent Decree Monitor for review before implementation until a time when the Consent Decree Monitor decides that such review is no longer necessary.

For those specific policies, procedures, or rules identified in this Decree, the parties expect that the Consent Decree Monitor will work with the City, Aurora Police, or Aurora Fire Rescue, as appropriate, to offer input early in the development process and stay engaged on progress. When Aurora finalizes a policy,

procedure, or rule that addresses a subject in this Decree, they must share it with the Consent Decree Monitor and discuss whether the Monitor agrees that the policy should be finalized. The Monitor must communicate its agreement or disagreement promptly, but absent a compelling reason, no more than 15 days from when it receives the proposed final policy. If Aurora and the Monitor cannot resolve any disagreements, they will use the agreed dispute resolution procedure outlined below in Section XI.

B. Training on Revised Policies, Procedures, and Practices

Having police officers and firefighters quickly and effectively trained on new or revised departmental policies is as important as getting policies developed, reviewed, and implemented. Aurora Police and Aurora Fire Rescue will incorporate best practices into training developed while this Consent Decree is in effect, including greater use of scenario-based training tools in both of their academies and in-service training. The Departments shall confer with the Consent Decree Monitor as needed to meet this goal and will seek guidance and assistance from outside subject matter experts as appropriate. When Aurora Police or Fire Rescue finalize a training plan identified in this Decree, they will share it with the Consent Decree Monitor and discuss whether the Monitor agrees that the training plan should be finalized. The Monitor will communicate its agreement or disagreement promptly, but absent a compelling reason, no more than 15 days from when it receives the

proposed final version of training plan. If Aurora Police or Fire Rescue and the Monitor cannot resolve any disagreements, they will use the agreed dispute resolution procedure outlined below in Section XI.

This Decree contains three key milestones governing when substantially all of the personnel interacting with the public will receive training on the revised policies on the core elements of this Decree. While this Decree contains deadlines for these milestones, Aurora may complete these milestones earlier than required, which could shorten the duration of this Decree, so long as Aurora remains in substantial compliance with the requirements of this Decree.

III. ADDRESSING RACIAL BIAS IN POLICING

A. Objectives

The City shall change, in measurable ways, how Aurora Police engages with all members of the community, including by reducing any racial disparities in how Aurora Police engages, arrests, and uses force in the community.

The City shall create full public transparency on how Aurora Police engages, arrests, and uses force in the community, including any disparities in these enforcement actions.

The City shall improve Aurora Police policies and training relevant to officer stops, arrests, and uses of force to give officers concrete guidance on how best to engage in critical decision-making and exercise discretion during community interactions, including by acknowledging the role that bias can play in enforcement decisions and developing strategies to combat bias.

B. Policy Changes

1. General Principles

As Aurora Police revises policies on issues outlined in this Consent Decree, it will work with the Consent Decree Monitor as described in Section II.A to develop or revise these policies.

2. Amendment of Existing Policies

Aurora Police will review and revise the following policies to prohibit discrimination based on protected class status and conform to the goals of the Consent Decree and applicable state and federal law, including by increasing the level of detail in the policy and providing examples of prohibited behavior:

- a. Directive 8.32 (Biased-Based Policing)
- b. Directive 6.01 (Arrest Procedure)

3. Creation of New Policies

a. Stops

Aurora Police will draft policies on the legal authority to make “stops,” more specifically detailed in Section V.B.2.a below. These policies will also provide specific, practical guidance intended to support officers in determining how to exercise their discretion when making stops.

This Consent Decree identifies the priority policies for Aurora to review. But the Consent Decree Monitor may recommend additional policies to draft or edit in order to address issues closely related to the subject matter of the Report and this Consent Decree but not specifically listed. If the Parties disagree with a request from the Consent Decree Monitor under this section, Section XI will apply to resolve any disputes that may arise.

C. Training

Aurora Police will develop and provide comprehensive academy and in-service training to police personnel in the following areas assisted by outside subject-matter experts, as necessary:

1. bias;
2. deliberate decision-making, including avoiding unnecessary escalation and teaching officers what they *should* do rather than what they *can* do;
3. recordkeeping requirements, including compliance with § 24-31-309(3.5); and
4. specific articulation of the basis for encounters, including stops and uses of force.

Aurora Police shall develop this training by the Bias Training Development Deadline and will work with the Consent Decree Monitor under Section II.B on this training. Aurora Police will train substantially all the police personnel who interact with the public on these policies by the Bias Training Completion Deadline. Aurora Police will include this training in its training curriculum throughout this Consent Decree.

D. Goals and Measurement

Aurora Police will develop metrics in consultation with the Consent Decree Monitor and outside experts to measure improvement in the areas described below. The Consent Decree Monitor will monitor compliance with this section and include updates on this item in their periodic updates to the Court.

1. Training provided on the topics identified in this section,
2. Recordkeeping on police interactions, and
3. Documentation and tracking of use-of-force incidents, including:
 - a. Monitoring misdemeanor arrest outcomes and
 - b. Tracking arrests and summons issued for particular offenses, such as “Failure to Obey a Lawful Order,” “Resisting Arrest,” “Criminal Trespass,” and related offenses.

IV. USE OF FORCE

A. Objectives

The City shall create improved policies and training to better equip officers to handle challenging situations in ways that reduce the use of force, ensure force is used in compliance with state and federal law, protect officer and community safety, and build a culture of continuous improvement.

The City shall create a culture of enforcement that prioritizes de-escalation when possible in accordance with Colorado law, but does not compromise officer safety when force must be used.

The City shall improve and develop accountability measures that consistently identify excessive uses of force, situations where force should not have been used even if it was legal, and recurring training and tactical issues related to use of force.

And lastly, the City shall create a culture of collaboration between Aurora Police and Aurora Fire Rescue that is coordinated and emphasizes public safety.

B. Policy Changes

1. General Principles

Aurora has already retained a team from the Crime and Justice Institute in Boston, Massachusetts to review and improve the use of force policies.

The Crime and Justice Institute's engagement with the City focuses on evaluating historical use of force by Aurora Police, developing an understanding of

the current use of force policies and practices, and recommending use of force policy changes based on direct communication with members of Aurora Police, the Aurora community, and exploration of use of force data.

The Parties expect this review to lead to more detailed policies that provide workable guidance to patrol officers to use force in compliance with state and federal law. This review will include input from the community, officers, and other stakeholders to ensure they address Aurora-specific needs.

This review will include at least the policies below and shall conclude by the Use of Force Policy Deadline. The Crime and Justice Institute will consult the Consent Decree Monitor to confirm that the policies comply with and address the use of force issues raised in the Report. Aurora Police will adopt the policies recommended by the review or, if it seeks to change the policies or not adopt them, confer with the Consent Decree Monitor on its desire to do so and provide alternate policies that address the use of force issues in the Report by the Use of Force Policy Adoption Deadline. Aurora Police will work with the Consent Decree Monitor under Section II.A to develop or revise these policies.

2. Amendment of Existing Policies

The City, assisted by the Crime and Justice Institute, as appropriate, will review, investigate, and make the appropriate changes, if any, to these policies:

- a. Directive 5.03 (Use of Physical and Deadly Force)
- b. Directive 5.04 (Reporting and Investigating the Use of Tools, Weapons and Physical Force)
- c. Directive 6.13 (Dealing with Persons with Mental Health Disorders)
- d. Directive 9.06 (Coordination with Aurora Fire Rescue and Emergency Medical Services)

In addition, this review shall include limiting the use of force in response to low-level offenses such as “failure to obey a lawful order” or “pedestrian failing to yield.”

3. Creation of New Policies

The City shall create policy, procedure, or other directive to facilitate the development of a comprehensive joint coordination policy between Aurora Police and Aurora Fire Rescue.

C. Force Review Board

Since the Attorney General began the Pattern & Practice investigation, Aurora Police has already made several changes to the Force Review Board. These changes include: 1) adding a standardized process to review each use of force, 2) placing commanders at the academy on the Force Review Board to allow for more immediate feedback on training, 3) including commanders in the Force Review

Board discussion of force incidents from that commander's unit, 4) requiring commanders to follow up on training and tactical issues identified by the Force Review Board with the patrol officers in each district, and 5) adding legal counsel to the Force Review Board.

If Aurora Police seeks to reverse any of the recent changes discussed in this section, it must first discuss those proposed changes with the Consent Decree Monitor following the process in Section II.A.

1. Changes to Process

In addition to these changes, the Force Review Board will, by the Force Review Board Process Improvement Deadline, modify its procedures or policies to:

1. formalize the process of giving feedback from the Force Review Board to those in charge of academy and in-service training, District Commanders, and Aurora Fire Rescue in incidents where no policy violation occurred but practices can be improved,
2. review each instance of force used in the context of the overall encounter, including the circumstances leading to its use and the mental capacity of the suspect, and
3. develop reliable ways to measure the frequency of use of force, compliance with policy, injuries to subjects, the safety of officers,

mental health holds used, and any other relevant measures of improvement.

Once the new Use of Force Policies discussed above are implemented, the Force Review Board shall promptly update its procedures or policies to evaluate use of force incidents against the updated policies, working with the Consent Decree Monitor on both policies and procedures under Section II.A.

2. Collaboration with Academy and Other Sections

A member of the academy staff now serves on the Force Review Board and the member's expertise in training is used in the evaluation of use of force cases and the member's experience on the Force Review Board informs the development of training. Recently, Aurora Police developed guidance on the use of body-worn camera video shown to the Force Review Board in recruit and in-service training classes at the academy. The videos selected will include both successful use of de-escalation and other techniques by Aurora police officers, and videos of incidents where improvement is recommended or needed.

D. Training

Aurora Police will ensure that the training described below is provided and delivered promptly, no later than the Use of Force Training Development Deadline.

1. Scenario-based training,

2. De-escalation, and
3. Joint police and fire training on scene coordination, as appropriate.

Aurora Police will work with the Consent Decree Monitor under Section II.B on this training and will include updates on this item in the periodic reports to the Court.

Aurora Police will train substantially all the police personnel who interact with the public by the Use of Force Training Completion Deadline.

E. Goals and Measurement

Aurora Police, in consultation with the Consent Decree Monitor and outside experts, will develop metrics to measure improvement in the areas listed below by the Use of Force Metrics Deadline. The Consent Decree Monitor will monitor compliance with this section and include updates on this item in the periodic reports to the Court. The metrics will include at least the following:

1. Participation in ABLE, crisis intervention, and other voluntary trainings,
2. Number and type of use-of-force incidents, and
3. Community and officer complaints.

V. DOCUMENTATION OF STOPS

A. Objectives

The City shall develop a documentation system that complies with state law, allows for prompt and transparent review of officer behavior, and improves the ability of Aurora Police to identify successes and areas for improvement.

The Parties recognize that recent legislative changes require a comprehensive update to the City's practices, which will take time to implement. The City will ensure that compliance with these statutes will occur within the time periods identified in this section.

B. Policy Changes

1. General Principles

Aurora Police will develop policies that comply with existing law as soon as practicable, and, in any event, no later than the Stops Policy Deadline. The City shall work to develop policies in a comprehensive manner that reduces the need for multiple trainings and policy updates. In addition to compliance with applicable law, the policies and platforms supporting the policies shall link information about officers involved with the stops to the required information about stops.

Aurora Police will work with the Consent Decree Monitor under Section II.A to develop or revise these policies.

2. Creation of New Policies

a. Legal Requirements for Stops

Aurora Police will create a new policy that provides specific guidance on legal requirements for the different types of stops that police officers make, including for “contacts,” “encounters,” “temporary detentions,” and “arrests.” This policy will cover both Colorado law and federal law, including, but not limited to, *Terry v. Ohio*, 392 U.S. 1 (1968).

b. Recordkeeping Requirements of C.R.S. §§ 24-31-309(3.5) and 24-31-903

Aurora Police will create a new policy for implementing the data collection requirements of C.R.S. §§ 24-31-309(3.5) and 24-31-903.

C. Training

Aurora Police will develop a training plan including, but not limited to, curriculum, material, and, if needed, scenario-based modules, in consultation with the Consent Decree Monitor and, as needed, outside experts, for implementing the new policies and for any revisions of current policies required by the Stops Training Plan Deadline. Aurora Police will work with the Consent Decree Monitor on this training under Section II.B. The Consent Decree Monitor may review training after it begins. Aurora Police will train substantially all the police personnel who interact with the public by the Stops Training Completion Deadline.

D. Goals and Measurement

Compliance with this section will be measured by 1) creating appropriate policies in the time required, 2) effectively training personnel in the time required, and 3) monitoring compliance with the policies based on performance in the field. Monitoring will include, at least, review of samples of body-worn camera footage, ride-alongs, and review of reports required by law, as appropriate. The Consent Decree Monitor may also monitor compliance by contacting those contacted by the police and reviewing complaints from the public and associated police documentation to the extent allowed by state and federal law and the Aurora City Charter.

VI. USE OF KETAMINE AND OTHER SEDATIVES AS A CHEMICAL RESTRAINT

A. Objectives

On September 15, 2020, before this Consent Decree and Judgment was negotiated and stipulated, the City and Aurora Fire Rescue stopped, and by policy forbid, the use of the drug ketamine in the field by Aurora Fire Rescue members.

If the City seeks to use ketamine in the field during the time that any part of this Consent Decree remains in effect, the Consent Decree Monitor will first review the medical protocol for the use of ketamine. Aurora Fire Rescue may not use ketamine in the field during the effective period of this Consent Decree without the agreement of the Consent Decree Monitor that its use complies with applicable law in consultation with the Aurora Fire Rescue Medical Director. Any objections that cannot be resolved will be resolved using the agreed dispute resolution procedure outlined below in Section XI.

The Parties share the goal of ensuring that the use of any chemical sedatives as chemical restraints in the field is done in accordance with applicable law and other requirements. The Report did not investigate the use of other chemical sedatives as chemical restraints in the field by Aurora Fire Rescue because ketamine was one of the two administered chemical sedatives used during the period of review by the Attorney General's office and it received substantial public

scrutiny. Therefore, for other chemical sedatives used as a chemical restraint, Aurora Fire will (1) ensure that policies and procedures reflect strict compliance with state law and any waiver requirements, and (2) closely review use of these sedatives to confirm policy compliance. This agreement is not intended to interfere with the Medical Director's determination of the need for and requirements for waivers for other controlled substances. The Consent Decree Monitor will periodically review Aurora Fire Rescue's use of chemical sedatives as chemical restraints to confirm policy compliance.

The Consent Decree Monitor will review and analyze the coordination of policies of Aurora Police and Aurora Fire Rescue to ensure that members of Aurora Police do not recommend, suggest, or otherwise encourage the use of any chemical restraint in the field by Aurora Fire Rescue. The use of any chemical restraint in the field will be a decision made only by qualified members of Aurora Fire Rescue and the applicable medical protocols in effect and approved by Aurora Fire's medical director in compliance with C.R.S. § 26-20-104 et seq.

The Consent Decree Monitor will meet and confer with each Department to resolve any objections raised by the Consent Decree Monitor. Any objections that cannot be resolved will be resolved using the agreed dispute resolution procedure outlined below in Section XI.

B. Definitions

A “chemical sedative” is a drug that slows down or depresses the central nervous system and therefore slows down both the physical and mental processes in the body. There are two main classes of prescription sedatives. The most commonly prescribed type are called benzodiazepines, which include drugs such as Xanax, Ativan, Midazolam or Versed, Klonopin, Valium, and Centrax. The other class of prescription sedatives are called barbiturates, which includes drugs such as Halcion, Nebutal, Seconal, and Butisol.

A “chemical sedative” becomes a “chemical restraint” when the chemical sedative is intentionally given to exert control over a person’s movements or behavior, not to treat a mental illness or physical condition.

C. Policy Changes if Ketamine is Used

The City and Aurora Fire Rescue have stated they do not intend to use ketamine again in the field, but if Aurora Fire Rescue does seek to reinstate ketamine usage in the field, Aurora Fire Rescue will work with the Consent Decree Monitor under Section II.A. The Consent Decree Monitor will work with the Medical Director to specifically focus on policy and procedure to ensure the policy dictates appropriate dosage recommendations and a procedure for how members of Aurora Fire Rescue will assess the level of patient agitation that would lead to the use of ketamine in the field.

D. Process Changes

1. Post-Incident Analysis for Ketamine Administrations if Ketamine is Used

Aurora Fire Rescue will develop a procedure for post-incident analysis that the Consent Decree Monitor must agree with, using the procedures in Section II.A, before Aurora Fire Rescue may use ketamine in the field.

2. Evaluation of Chemical Sedation

In addition to the current process of reviewing each incident where Aurora Fire Rescue uses chemical sedation as a chemical restraint in the field, Aurora Fire Rescue shall develop a process to periodically review its use of chemical sedation in the field to determine what improvements should be made to policy or training at Aurora Fire Rescue or Aurora Police, including assessing 1) whether the symptoms justified sedation under law and policy, 2) the involvement of police officers before or during a patient's sedation, and 3) what factors increase the risk of adverse outcomes to patients or providers.

Aurora Fire Rescue shall summarize this periodic review to the Consent Decree Monitor at least twice a year, starting 6 months from the effective date. This summary will include at least information about the number of times Aurora Fire Rescue used chemical sedation as a chemical restraint, the symptoms justifying sedation, the type of chemical restraint used, whether Aurora Fire Rescue followed policy, what information police officers provided to Aurora Fire Rescue for

compliance with C.R.S. § 18-8-805, and basic information about the use such as the tabular data included on pages 97-98 of the Report. Nothing in this section should be construed to discourage Aurora Police from providing Aurora Fire Rescue with necessary information about an incident, as this information will only be used to comply with C.R.S. § 18-8-805(2)(b).¹ This requirement does not require the public disclosure of any confidential information.

E. Goals and Measurement

If the City implements the use of ketamine in the field again using the process set forth above, the Monitor will review any use regularly and include such review in the Court reports addressing at least the issues identified in the Report on the reporting timetables set forth in Section IX.A.5.

¹ C.R.S. § 18-8-805(2)(b) states that “A peace officer shall not unduly influence an emergency medical service provider’s medical decision or diagnosis, and an emergency medical service provider shall not base its medical decision or diagnosis exclusively on information provided by a peace officer.”

VII. RECRUITMENT, HIRING, AND PROMOTION

A. Objectives

The City will transform recruiting and hiring processes to create a more diverse and qualified workforce and establish Aurora Police and Aurora Fire Rescue's commitments to a culture of continuous improvement and becoming better police and fire departments.

The City will also improve transparency, accountability, and predictability in discipline review, including by facilitating the Civil Service Commission's standardization and codification of elements of its disciplinary review process.

The City will also improve transparency and accountability about all of the Civil Service Commission's work, such that community members understand the role that the Commission plays in hiring, promotion, and discipline, as well as any changes the Commission makes to those processes.

B. Recruitment

To maintain high-quality service, ensure employee safety and accountability, and promote constitutional, effective policing, Aurora Police and Aurora Fire Rescue will review and revise as necessary recruitment and hiring programs to ensure that Aurora Police and Aurora Fire Rescue successfully attract and hire a diverse group of qualified individuals for their civil service positions.

Aurora Police and Aurora Fire Rescue will develop written recruitment plans that include, but are not limited to, these items: clear goals, objectives, and action steps for attracting and retaining a quality work force that better reflects the diversity of the City.

The recruitment plans should include, at a minimum, the following:

1. A schedule to work with the Civil Service Commission to review and make any applicable changes to the minimum qualifications for entry-level police and fire recruits and lateral hires;
2. A plan to conduct outreach to many community leaders and stakeholders, aimed at increasing the diversity of each Department's applicant pool—including race, color, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, national origin, and religion—and identifying recruit and lateral applicants that are committed to community-oriented policing (for police officers) and have the identified skills to succeed in the applicable role;
3. A plan to broadly distribute information about career opportunities, compensation, hiring, the applicable testing process(es), and deadlines and other requirements of each position throughout the Denver metro-area regularly. The same information will be easily available on the

City's website, with the ability for interested persons to directly contact a member of the recruiting team of each Department.

The recruitment plan shall be developed by the Recruitment Plan Deadline and then provided to the Consent Decree Monitor for review and agreement, using the process set out in Section II.A.

C. Civil Service Commission

1. Hiring of Entry-Level Police Officers and Firefighters

Before the effective date of this Consent Decree, the Civil Service Commission handled the entire process of hiring entry-level police officers and firefighters. This process led to new civil service employees and the departments meeting each other for the first time after the new employee is appointed and assigned to the training academy. To implement this Consent Decree and the policies and goals it requires, this process will be reworked so that Aurora Police and Aurora Fire Rescue, with coordination and assistance from the Aurora Human Resources Department, will assume a much more active role in the hiring of candidates from the eligibility lists prepared by the Commission and have the final say on which candidates are hired. The new procedures will require a change and recodification of the current Rules and Regulations of the Civil Service Commission. The City Manager, with assistance from Human Resources as needed, will work

with the Civil Service Commission to bring about those changes by the Civil Service Commission Rules and Regulation Modification Deadline. The Consent Decree Monitor will review these modified procedures solely to ensure they meet the objectives of this section and are not inconsistent with other goals of this Decree using the process set out in Section II.A.

Nothing in this section is intended to modify or violate the Aurora City Charter and the duties designated to the Civil Service Commission, the Police Department, and Aurora Fire Rescue.

2. Promotion

The Commission will work with the Consent Decree Monitor and the outside expert (see paragraph 4 , below) to make changes, if any, to the promotional process.

3. Discipline

The Civil Service Commission will update its Rules and Regulations by the Civil Service Commission Rules and Regulations Modification Deadline and this update will include, at a minimum:

- a. guidelines that substantially reduce the time disciplinary cases take from filing to resolution, including to strongly consider not allowing a full “de novo” review of disciplinary cases and instead handling them

as a more appellate style of review within the parameters set forth by the Aurora Charter;

- b. requirements about the content of disciplinary decisions, including that discipline decisions include plain statements of the actual allegations, defenses, findings, and basis for the decision so that a member of the public can understand, from that document alone, what gave rise to the discipline and the reasons the Commission affirmed or modified that discipline; and
- c. requirements that as much of the business of the Civil Service Commission as possible be easily accessible to the public by website, including discipline decisions and all requests for continuances, and specific identification of what is not public and the basis for keeping it not public.

Aurora will work with the Consent Decree Monitor under Section II.A to finalize these changes.

4. Outside Expert

The City or the Civil Service Commission, in consultation with the Consent Decree Monitor, will select and hire an outside expert with expertise in best practices for recruiting and hiring a qualified and diverse public safety workforce of

police officers and firefighters within the framework of the authority of the Commission provided by the Charter. This outside expert shall be retained by the Civil Service Commission Outside Expert Retention Deadline.

5. Transparency

To improve transparency about the operations of the Commission, the Commission shall conduct as much of its business as possible so that the public may easily access it by website, and specifically identify what is not public and the basis for keeping it not public.

VIII. ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY

A. Objectives

The City will develop systems that permit Aurora Police to regularly and easily identify trends and patterns in the conduct of its officers, including, but not limited to, conduct that repeatedly gives rise to claims of civil liability; conduct or specific officers implicated in multiple citizen or officer complaints; and repeated conduct that suggests a need for further training or policy review. These systems shall have the ability to track, among other things, conduct by officer, supervisor, shift, beat, and district.

B. Goals and Measurement

Aurora Police, in consultation with the Consent Decree Monitor and outside experts, will develop a system and process to track and follow the following subject matters for use in decision making and for transparency to the public:

1. Tracking of officers' disciplinary outcomes,
2. Identification of trends or patterns of sustained complaints about officers' law enforcement activities, and
3. Public reporting of data collection.

The Police Department and Consent Decree Monitor will develop the initial plan for this data collection by the Initial Measurement Plan Deadline.

IX. IMPLEMENTATION, ENFORCEMENT, AND MONITORING

A. Independent Consent Decree Monitor

1. Selection

The City previously issued a Request for Proposal to seek qualified proposals from individuals and firms that would like to serve in the role of the Consent Decree Monitor. The Parties expect that the Consent Decree Monitor will be retained shortly after the Court enters this Consent Decree.

2. Scope of Assignment

This Consent Decree sets forth the specific scope of the Consent Decree Monitor's duties. In summary, the Consent Decree Monitor will oversee the City of Aurora's implementation of this Consent Decree, including engaging in effective community outreach to understand concerns, specific encounters causing frustration, and what Aurora is doing well; issuing public updates to the Court on the City's compliance with the Consent Decree; providing guidance and recommendations on compliance with the Consent Decree to the City of Aurora, the Aurora Police Department, and Aurora Fire Rescue, including reviewing and commenting on policies, training, and initiatives developed under the Consent Decree; and working closely with leadership and staff from the City, Aurora Police, and Aurora Fire Rescue. In undertaking its responsibility to ensure Aurora's compliance with this decree, the Consent Decree Monitor will serve as a resource

and a coach as needed to help Aurora succeed in the commitments the City is making in this decree. The parties expect the Consent Decree Monitor to communicate informally with all parts of the organization in a way that supports the chain of command.

The parties will select the Consent Decree Monitor, and the Monitor could use a team approach with a lead Monitor, supported by a small team of additional subject matter experts.

The Independent Consent Decree Monitor is not an employee of the City and shall serve as a “service provider” to the City.

The Consent Decree Monitor should focus their work on issues of substance, rather than areas of style or preference, in carrying out their work under this Decree.

3. Cost

As stated in the City’s Request for Proposal for a Consent Decree Monitor, the City will pay the Consent Decree Monitor either an annual fixed price based on the scope of work and scope of services, or hourly with an annual not-to-exceed amount. Pricing may include different pricing for different years of the Consent Decree Monitoring. Pricing can include travel allowances for key team members. The final contract with the agreed upon Consent Decree Monitor will include the

possibility for Change Orders to allow for Pricing changes in the event of truly unexpected developments.

The City is responsible for the costs, services, and expenses of the Consent Decree Monitor, as authorized by the written contract with the Consent Decree Monitor. The Independent Consent Decree Monitor shall not substitute or replace their own judgment or decision in place of any official decision, as authorized by the City Charter or other applicable law, made by the Aurora Fire Rescue Chief or Police Chief. Instead, the Monitor will use the Dispute Resolution Procedure in the event of any disagreement.

4. Procedures for Communication with Aurora, Aurora Police, and Aurora Fire

The Consent Decree Monitor will need to communicate with members of the City staff, the Police Department, the Fire Rescue Department, and the Civil Service Commission from time to time in order to perform the duties required under this Consent Decree. These communications are subject to the provisions of Confidentiality outlined below in Paragraph 6, “Confidentiality and Records Disclosure.”

5. Reporting Requirements

The Consent Decree Monitor shall provide regular public updates to the Court on the efforts of the City, Aurora Police, Aurora Fire Rescue, and the Civil

Service Commission to achieve compliance under the Consent Decree. However, the Parties agree that the Consent Decree Monitor should spend most of its time on the action items in the Consent Decree rather than write updates.

The Consent Decree Monitor will also develop mechanisms for engaging the community and measuring the effects of the City's efforts under the Consent Decree.

The regular updates will be provided on the following schedule, unless otherwise agreed to by the Parties:

For the first-year term of the Consent Decree: No less than quarterly.

For the remaining term of the Consent Decree: No less than bi-annually.

Despite the above, the parties can by unanimous consent upon conferral reduce the reporting timelines set forth in this paragraph.

6. Confidentiality and Records Disclosure

The City will provide full access to its documents and personnel to the Consent Decree Monitor. Because some of the information that the Monitor will review contains confidential information, such as victim information, confidential personnel information, and other information protected from disclosure by Colorado law, the Consent Decree Monitor must maintain the confidentiality of such information. Nothing in this Consent Decree will be construed as a waiver of the

Colorado Open Records Act (“CORA”), C.R.S. § 24-72-200.1 et seq.; the Colorado Criminal Justice Records Act (“CCJRA”), C.R.S. § 24-72-301 et seq.; or any other privilege held by the Parties. For this Consent Decree, the Consent Decree Monitor will be considered to hold the same confidentiality duties and CORA or CCJRA protections as the Parties.

If the Consent Decree Monitor is served with any request for information, whether formally or informally, the Monitor must forward this request to the Parties within seventy-two (72) hours of receipt of this request and will coordinate with the Parties in resolving this request. The Monitor will not release any confidential information without first providing notice to the relevant parties and giving them an opportunity to promptly respond. Nothing in this section shall preclude the Monitor from releasing information in accordance with a Court Order.

If the Consent Decree Monitor believes that information in a regular update to be filed with this Court contains confidential information, the Consent Decree Monitor will redact the confidential information from the update and file the redacted version with the Court. Separately, the Monitor shall file an unredacted version of the Update with the Court under seal.

7. Counsel for Independent Consent Decree Monitor

Neither the City of Aurora nor the Attorney General shall provide legal representation for the Independent Consent Decree Monitor.

If the Independent Consent Decree Monitor has a question about the meaning of some provision of this Decree, it shall seek guidance from the City of Aurora and the Attorney General. If both parties agree on the meaning, that meaning shall guide the Independent Consent Decree Monitor. In the unlikely event that both parties do not agree, the Independent Consent Decree Monitor may seek independent legal counsel on that question, with the expense for that counsel paid for by the City of Aurora. Before retaining counsel, the Independent Consent Decree Monitor shall work to ensure the costs are reasonable and appropriate and obtain the consent of the City of Aurora and the Attorney General to retain that counsel on those terms. If the parties do not consent, the Dispute Resolution Procedures of Section XI.B will apply.

B. Compliance

1. Self-Reporting Encouraged

The City is encouraged to report to the Consent Decree Monitor any violations of any requirements of this Consent Decree. In evaluating any consequence for violating this decree, the Parties request that the Court consider whether the violation was self-reported.

2. Independent Consent Decree Monitor Role

The Independent Consent Decree Monitor's primary responsibility shall be ensuring that the City complies with its obligations under this Consent Decree without creating excessive cost or inefficiencies. The Parties agree that the Consent Decree Monitor will have access to any documents or proceedings that it requests from the City. Any documents or other records received by the Consent Decree Monitor from the City will be subject to the confidentiality provisions of Section IX.A.6, above.

3. Attorney General Role

The Consent Decree Monitor will primarily review and ensure compliance with this Decree. The Attorney General may consult the Consent Decree Monitor on any aspect of this Decree.

4. Court Role

The parties agree and request that the Court be the decider of last resort on any disputed issues that may arise under this Consent Decree using the process set forth in the Dispute Resolution Procedures in Section XI below. The Court shall ensure that the Parties have tried to resolve any disputes that may arise under this Consent Decree first without Court action, and that this agreement, and conduct taken under this Consent Decree, comply with all state and federal law and the City of Aurora Charter.

X. DURATION AND TERMINATION

A. Term

Aurora will spend up to two years changing its operations and training to meet the requirements of this Decree and then three years confirming compliance through monitoring, measurement, and making additional adjustments. If Aurora implements the requirements earlier, the three-year compliance period starts running earlier and the Decree may last less than five years.

The Decree establishes three Training Completion milestones—when Aurora has trained substantially all of the relevant personnel on Addressing Bias in Policing, Use of Force, and Documentation of Stops. This Consent Decree will have a term of three years from the date the last Training Completion milestone is met. And as described below in Section X.B.1, Aurora may seek to terminate parts of this Consent Decree three years after it meets a particular milestone.

The parties recognize that this Decree requires significant and lasting reform at Aurora. Aurora has committed to that reform in this Decree through, among other things, changing important policies, developing new training materials, and training its personnel on these new policies. In addition, Aurora will operate in a much more transparent manner by changing core processes and sharing more information with the public. The parties expect that these changes will lead to improved outcomes in areas identified in the Report.

Before termination of any kind, Aurora must have substantially complied with the relevant requirements of this Consent Decree. In evaluating whether Aurora has “substantially complied” with this Decree, the parties intend that Aurora’s demonstrated commitment to continuous improvement throughout the term of this Decree be the primary focus and the standard used for evaluating Aurora’s “substantial compliance” with this Consent Decree. The parties recognize that later developments outside the control of Aurora, such as state or federal legislation, may require some flexibility in the evaluation of substantial compliance with this Consent Decree. And because this Consent Decree requires the development of some of the metrics used to evaluate Aurora’s performance, initial measurements may reflect improved information gathering rather than the progress of the organization. The Parties’ goal is substantial compliance with this Consent Decree.

B. Requirements for Termination

1. Full Termination

For termination of the entire Consent Decree, 90 days before the end of the term, the Consent Decree Monitor shall inform the Court and the Parties of its view of whether Aurora has substantially complied with the Consent Decree. If so, the Court shall terminate the Consent Decree at the end of the term. If the Consent Decree Monitor concludes that Aurora has not substantially complied with the

Consent Decree at the end of the term, a hearing shall promptly be held where the Monitor, Aurora, and the Attorney General shall appear and provide information for the Court to determine whether Aurora should be released from the Decree, either in whole or in part. Nothing in this section prohibits Aurora and the Attorney General from agreeing to make appropriate modifications to the Decree, including extending the full Decree, part of the Decree, or making other modifications to the Decree. Any objections that cannot be resolved will be resolved using the agreed dispute resolution procedure outlined below in Section XI.

2. Partial Early Termination by Subject

As compliance with sections of the Consent Decree is considered complete by the City, the City may submit a request to the Consent Decree Monitor and the Attorney General to find a section of the Consent Decree “complete,” leading to the City no longer being subject to the requirements in the completed section. The City will not make any such request before three years from any Training Completion milestone. For those sections without a Training Completion milestone, the City will not make any such request before three years after completion of the last substantial step required by that section.

Within 15 days of the request, the Consent Decree Monitor will review the request, draft an executive summary of the Consent Decree Monitor’s position on the request, and submit it to the Parties. The Consent Decree Monitor may extend

this time to investigate the request and seek public input. Once the executive summary is sent to the parties, the parties have 15 days to communicate any objection to the decision of the Consent Decree Monitor on the request. If the decision of the Consent Decree Monitor is to approve the termination of a section of the Consent Decree, the City may then file a Notice to the Court of the Consent Decree Monitor's decision that the section(s) are complete and the City should no longer be subject to the requirements of the completed section of the Consent Decree.

XI. DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROCEDURE

A. Objective

The Parties expect and encourage the City and the Consent Decree Monitor to work together collaboratively to address the changes required in this Consent Decree. In the rare circumstances when the City and the Consent Decree Monitor cannot agree on a path forward consistent with the requirements of this Consent Decree, the following procedure is agreed upon by the Parties to resolve those disputes:

B. Resolution Process

1. The City or the Consent Decree Monitor must communicate in writing to the other and the Attorney General's office that they believe that an impasse has been reached on an issue and state their final position on the issue. The written notice must provide the section of this Decree in dispute.
2. The other party must communicate their final position on the issue within 7 days.
3. Informal mediation is encouraged to settle any dispute that may arise under this section. The involved parties, the Monitor, and their legal counsel, if appropriate, must actively participate in good faith in the informal mediation process to resolve the dispute within 14 days.

4. If the dispute has not been resolved after the 14 days, the City must notify the Court within 3 days of the conclusion of the 14-day resolution period, and all parties and the Monitor may file submissions, in whatever form the Court may prefer, 14 days after notification setting forth their final positions and specifically identifying their proposed resolution of the issue.

5. The Parties all request that the Court select the most appropriate resolution from among the three proposed resolutions, rather than crafting a compromise position, so that the parties will be motivated to resolve these issues through negotiated resolution rather than judicial intervention. That said, even though the Parties prefer that the Court select one of the three proposed resolutions submitted, nothing in this Consent Decree removes the Court's judicial authority to make its own decision about a disputed issue.

XII. DEADLINES

	Days from effective date of contract with Monitor
<i>Addressing Racial Bias in Policing</i>	
Bias Training Development Deadline	365
Bias Training Completion Deadline	730
<i>Use of Force</i>	
Force Review Board Process Improvement Deadline	120
Use of Force Metrics Deadline	150
Use of Force Policy Deadline	270
Use of Force Policy Adoption Deadline	300
Use of Force Training Development Deadline	365
Use of Force Training Completion Deadline	540
<i>Documentation of Stops</i>	
Documentation of Contacts Policy Adoption Deadline	90
Stops Policy Deadline	120
Stops Policy Training Deadline	180
Stops Training Completion Deadline	365
<i>Recruitment, Hiring, and Promotion</i>	
Civil Service Commission Outside Expert Retention Deadline	90
Recruitment Plan Deadline	455
Civil Service Commission Rules and Regulations Modification Deadline	455
<i>Accountability and Transparency</i>	
Initial Measurement Plan Deadline	365

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: _____

DISTRICT JUDGE
Arapahoe County, Colorado

APPENDIX E

METHODOLOGIES TO AID IN THE DETERMINATION OF COMPLIANCE (MADC)

INTRODUCTION

In the pages that follow we explain in detail the methodologies which will be utilized by the Independent Consent Decree Monitor (“the Monitor”) to assess each substantive provision of the Consent Decree (“the Decree”). While compliance monitoring in a policing environment is a dynamic process by the nature of the task, it is critical to the process that the method does not change mid-stream. It is for those reasons that these methodologies have been arrived at collaboratively with the parties and the stakeholders. The methodologies are designed to allow the parties and the public to fully understand and appreciate what is expected of the City of Aurora (“City”), the Aurora Police Department (“APD”), Aurora Fire Rescue (“AFR”), and the Aurora Civil Service Commission (“CSC”) in terms of achieving compliance with each mandate (substantive provision) of the Consent Decree. In essence, this document is designed to provide transparency to all stakeholders and to serve as the roadmap to compliance thus allowing for focus of the parties on the goals of the Decree.

It is the Monitor’s belief that the application of the methodologies contained herein will, in the vast majority of cases, be dispositive of the issue of compliance. The Monitor must, nonetheless, reserve the right to reach conclusions relative to compliance which may be at odds with the results of any mechanical formulations enumerated in this document. Should such occasion arise, it will be incumbent upon the Monitor to maintain transparency and clearly articulate the reasons and rationale for deviation from the measures contained in this document.

The Monitor in no way intends by this document, to limit full access to documents, meetings or facilities which may not be specifically referred to herein, or to limit its ability to utilize techniques not specifically enumerated herein in order to validate the methodologies defined herein.

Lastly, although this document envisions scheduled reviews, the Monitor intends to continuously be on the lookout for significant deviations from individual mandates of the Decree or its underlying goals. In any instance in which such deviation is noted, it will be incumbent upon the Monitor to bring that to the attention of the parties as soon as practicable, clearly articulating the basis for such conclusion and, working with the parties, providing direction on how to remediate the situation.

Substantial Compliance

The goal of the Consent Decree is to bring about significant and lasting reform brought about through substantial compliance with each of the Decree’s mandates. In determining overall substantial compliance, while each individual mandate will be evaluated according to the methodologies set forth in this document, the determination with respect to overall substantial compliance will be made not only through the evaluation of the individual mandates, but also through an evaluation of the City’s overall commitment to and fulfillment of the goal of significant and lasting reform brought about through a demonstrated process of continuous improvement.

While individual mandates of the Decree may be deemed to be in substantial compliance after three years of demonstration of such, the entire Decree is expected to last a full five years

accounting for at least some mandates related to training not having been completed for a period of two years. (Should all training milestones be met earlier than two years, it is possible, assuming operational compliance going forward for three years from the date of the completion of the last training milestone, that the entire consent decree could terminate in less than the contemplated five years.)

Full Termination of the Consent Decree

Pursuant to the terms of the Decree, 90 days prior to the end of the term [three years from the date the last of three training milestones (Bias, Use of Force and Stops)] is met, the Monitor will inform the Court and the Parties of its view of whether Aurora has substantially complied with the Decree. Should the Monitor determine that the City has substantially complied with the Consent Decree, the Decree will be terminated by the Court. To the extent that the Monitor does not believe that the City has substantially complied, either the parties will agree to some extension of all or part of the Decree, or the Court will make a determination as to whether and how the Decree should be extended.

Partial Termination of the Consent Decree

The City may request termination of any individual mandate of the Decree, as contained herein, after three years of substantial compliance with its terms. The effect of termination of any particular mandate would need to be approved by the Monitor and would remove that mandate from continued monitoring or other requirements of the Decree.

Monitor Suggestions of Related Policy Creation or Modification

Given the role of the Monitor, it is entirely possible that the Monitor will identify policy changes not directly contemplated by the Decree which, in the judgment of the Monitor, should nonetheless, be created or modified in order to address Consent Decree related issues. To the extent that the Monitor finds this to be the case, the Monitor will make any such recommendations to the Parties. To the extent that such recommendation is accepted by the Parties or is ordered by the Court, a Methodology to Aid in the Determination of Compliance will be drafted for that particular policy.

Methodology Sections

Consent Decree Title

This refers to the title of the relevant portion of the Consent Decree. In some instances, this is the title contained in the Consent Decree itself, in other instances it may be a further mandate derivative from a title in a preceding section of the Decree.

Consent Decree Reference/Page Number

We have assigned each mandate within the Consent Decree a “Mandate Number” and have provided the specific section of the Consent Decree from which the mandate is derived as well as the page number of the Consent Decree where the mandate may be found.

Consent Decree Text

The verbatim mandate of the Consent Decree that will be monitored is reproduced in the section labeled “Text.” Each mandate requires the City, APD, AFR and/or CSC (“specified entities”) to establish policy, conduct training, implement policies/procedures, and/or to conduct reviews to validate whether such policies/procedures have been implemented.

Task Description

This is a plain language description of “what” has been agreed upon as the task which needs to be accomplished by the relevant City entity.

Monitoring Methodology

This section explains “how” the steps the Monitor will take in determining compliance with the relevant mandate of the Decree. Although this document is quite specific regarding the Monitor’s methodologies, as noted above, the Monitor in no way intends to limit its ability to utilize techniques not specifically enumerated herein in order to further measure compliance and/or to validate the results of the monitoring tasks already undertaken. In addition, as noted above, the Monitor reserves the right to reach conclusions relative to compliance that may differ from the results of performing the specific tasks described herein. Should such an occasion arise, the Monitor’s report(s) will describe the rationale for deviating from the methodologies described herein.

Compliance Definition

This section describes the specific steps that must be completed by the City and its constituent agencies in order to achieve compliance with a particular mandate. The measurement will differ depending on the mandate itself. Some measurements may be quantitative while others will be qualitative, and some could contain both types of measurement. Each will require the production and review of data or the observation by the monitor of a particular activity.

Required Data

This is a listing of the specific data which will be required for the Monitor to assess compliance for each mandate. For each particular segment of data, a data-request will be made to the relevant City agency along with a due date for the satisfaction of that request. Where appropriate and in conformance with standard auditing techniques, the Monitor may identify and review independent sources of information, both external and internal, to verify the accuracy

and completeness of data under review. For example, in assessing compliance with requirements regarding uses of force, the Monitor may review complaints to test whether all uses of force are being reported

Sample Required

For some mandates less than 100% of the available data will be tested in order to determine compliance. The Monitor will determine the sample size and composition in any case in which less than all of the data will be analyzed.

Timeline and Schedule

Each mandate of the Decree will have one or more assessment dates which correspond to the Reporting Period (RP) in which the assessment will occur. The timeline for the determination of compliance will, in some instances, be set by the time mandates of the decree itself (see Section XII of the Decree at page 45), and in other instances by the Monitor to best satisfy the goals of the Decree. Despite the schedule of assessments as set forth in this document, the Monitor may rely for the timing of its determination of compliance, by a self-assessment of the City (see below) as to whether it believes the City is in compliance with a particular provision of the Decree or not. In some instances, this self-assessment may move a scheduled assessment to an earlier date, while in other instances it may defer the compliance assessment to a later period. In all instances however, an assessment of compliance with any particular provision will be fully tested by the Monitor according to the delineated methodologies.

The Reporting Periods will correspond to the public reports which will be issued by the Monitor at Quarterly Intervals and thereafter at bi-annual intervals. The Reporting Periods will be as follows:

Reporting Periods

RP No.	Period Begins	Period Ends	Draft Report Due	Final Report Published
1	2/15/22	5/15/22	6/15/22	7/15/22
2	5/16/22	8/15/22	9/15/22	10/15/22
3	8/16/22	11/15/22	12/15/22	1/15/23
4	11/16/22	2/15/23	3/15/23	4/15/23
5	2/16/23	8/15/23	9/15/23	10/15/23
6	8/16/23	2/15/24	3/15/24	4/15/24
7	2/16/24	8/15/24	9/15/24	10/15/24
8	8/16/24	2/15/25	3/15/25	4/15/25
9	2/16/25	8/15/25	9/15/25	10/15/25
10	8/16/25	2/15/26	3/15/26	4/15/26
11	2/16/26	8/15/26	9/15/26	10/15/26
12	8/16/26	2/15/27	3/15/27	4/15/27

Cross References

Any cross references with related provisions of the Decree will be listed in this section. This will include mandates compliance with which are conditions precedent to an evaluation of a different mandate.

Monitor Forms

For some mandates, the Monitor may develop forms to aid and record the determination of compliance with a given data set. Such forms will be listed in this section.

Self-Assessment

For each mandate of the Decree, the Monitor will request that the respective City agency submit a self-assessment ("Proffer of Compliance") which explains in detail the agency's assessment of compliance and the reasons therefor. The Monitor will request this proffer in a timeframe that corresponds to the Monitor's assessment dates. The entity may also submit a proffer at any time before assessment, when it believes compliance has been achieved prior to the scheduled assessment. To the extent that an Agency believes that, notwithstanding the Methodologies contained in this document, it has substantially complied with an individual Mandate, the Monitor will welcome a proffer which contains the alternative method by which the agency has formed its belief.

Technical Assistance

There may be instances where the City wishes to call upon the Monitoring Team to provide technical assistance not within the Scope of Assignment called for by the Consent Decree. This could take the form of providing such assistance either directly through our existing Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) or through our engagement of additional SME's. In either case, such assistance will require a request and approval from the City before the additional out-of-scope assistance will be provided. Because such assistance is not inherent to the Consent Decree, the Methodologies listed below, do not include such assistance in the outlined workflow.

Specific Mandate Methodologies

The specific Methodology for each mandate follows:

SECTION II – GENERAL POLICY & TRAINING

TITLE	Policies and Training Generally
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 1 at II (Page 4)
TEXT	Aurora Fire Rescue and Aurora Police agree to develop comprehensive policies and procedures that ensure implementation of this Consent Decree. In addition, Aurora Fire Rescue and Aurora Police will work to ensure policies are consistent and complementary, conduct training to ensure coordinated responses, and hold officers and firefighters accountable for violating policy.
TASK DESCRIPTION	The Monitor will determine if the APD and AFR are developing comprehensive policies to ensure the implementation of the Consent Decree and that the policies of each department are consistent and complementary. The Monitor will determine if the training is being conducted to ensure coordinated responses and that officers and firefighters are being held accountable for violation of policy.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Use the Monitor's assessment of compliance from all mandates requiring policy and procedure development (for APD Mandates 2, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 34, 35, 36, 39, 42, 49, 50, 52, 54, 56, 58, 60, 67, 67 and for AFR Mandates 41, 42, 44, 46, 49, 53, 55, 57, 59, 60, 65) to evaluate and conclude on the comprehensiveness of same. 2. Confirm implementation using the Monitor's assessments of same. 3. Use the Monitor's assessment of compliance from all training development and delivery (for APD Mandates 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 29, 30, 31, 37, 38, 39, 42, 67 and for AFR Mandates 31 and 42). 4. Verify that both APD and AFR disciplinary policies specify the repercussions for policy violations. 5. Review Force Review Board (FRB) outcomes, Early Intervention System data, complaint/misconduct investigations of both APD and AFR to determine if accountability mechanisms have appropriately addressed any policy violations.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The APD and AFR achieve compliance with all Mandates requiring policy development (for APD Mandates 2, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 34, 35, 36, 39, 42, 49, 50, 52, 54, 56, 58, 60, 67, 67 and for AFR Mandates 41, 42, 44, 46, 49, 53, 55, 57, 59, 60, 65) and those policies are implemented; 2. The APD and AFR achieve compliance with all Mandates requiring training development and/or delivery (for APD Mandates 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 29, 30, 31, 37, 38, 39, 42, 67 and for AFR Mandates 31 and 42). and those trainings required to be conducted jointly have been delivered; and,

	3. The APD and AFR's internal review and accountability processes and the related SOPs specify appropriate discipline and remedial training measures for instances when policies are violated.
REQUIRED DATA	Derivative from other relevant mandates; accountability data including citizen complaints; early intervention and discipline; self-assessments from the APD and AFR.
SAMPLE REQUIRED	
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Reporting on this general mandate will be done in each report and with compliance assessments being derivative from each component
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandates 2, 6- 31, 34- 39, 41-42, 44, 46, 49-50, 52-60, 65, and 67
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Policy development, review and implementation process
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 2 at II A (Page 4)
TEX	Aurora will work with the Independent Consent Decree Monitor to evaluate the development, review and implementation processes for Aurora's policies, procedures, and rules outlined in the Consent Decree. The parties agree that Aurora must develop procedures that speed up the policy development, review, and implementation process.
TASK DESCRIPTION	The Monitor will determine if the APD, AFR and CSC have developed and implemented an appropriate procedure that will govern and speed up the policy development, review and implementation process.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review and evaluate the APD's, AFR's and CSC's policy development, review and implementation processes related to compliance with the Consent Decree. 2. Determine if any improvements can be made to decrease the length of time it takes for policy development, review, and implementation. 3. Confirm if the above process were in fact improved where possible. 4. Confirm that the process is documented within relevant Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) and/or Rules and Regulations. 5. Verify that all entities are following the SOPs and/or Rules and Regulations.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The APD, AFR and CSC have decreased the length of time, wherever possible, of the process by which Consent Decree related policies are developed, reviewed, and implemented. 2. The related processes are documented within relevant SOPs and/or Rules and Regulations. 3. The standards in the above SOPs and/or Rules and Regulations are being adhered to.
REQUIRED DATA	Written directive/SOPs/Rules and Regulations outlining the method by which policies are developed, reviewed and implemented; and self-assessment by City (or APD, AFR and CSC).
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Reporting on this general mandate will be done in each report and with compliance assessments being derivative from each component

CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandates 2, 6-7, 9-11, 16, 18-28, 34-36, 39, 41- 42,44, 46, 49-50, 52- 60, 65, and 67
MONITOR FORM(S)	N/A

TITLE	Submission of new policies for review
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 3 at IIA (Page 4)
TEXT	During the time covered by the Consent Decree, Aurora will submit any new or revised policies, procedures, or rules outlined in this Consent Decree to the Consent Decree Monitor for review before implementation until a time when the Consent Decree Monitor decides that such review is no longer necessary.
TASK DESCRIPTION	The Monitor will determine if all new or revised policies, procedures and rules called for by the Consent Decree (CD) have been submitted to the CD Monitor for review before implementation.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	Use the Monitor's assessment of compliance from all mandates requiring policy and procedure development (APD : 2, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 34, 35, 36, 39, 42, 49, 50, 52, 54, 56, 58, 60, 67, 67, for AFR : 41, 42, 44, 46, 49, 53, 55, 57, 59, 60, 65 and for CSC : 50, 51, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66) to confirm that all policies have been submitted to the Monitor for review prior to implementation.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance with Mandate 3 will be achieved when compliance is achieved on all mandates requiring policy or procedure development and implementation (APD : 2, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 34, 35, 36, 39, 42, 49, 50, 52, 54, 56, 58, 60, 67, 67, for AFR : 41, 42, 44, 46, 49, 53, 55, 57, 59, 60, 65 and for CSC : 50, 51, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66).
REQUIRED DATA	Drafts of all new policies, procedures or rules, self-assessment from the City (or APD, AFR and CSC)
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Derivative from each new policy, procedure or rule
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandates 2, 6-7, 9-11, 16, 18-28, 34-36, 39, 41- 42,44, 46, 49-50, 52- 60, 65, and 67
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Incorporation of Best Practices and Scenario-based Training
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 4 at IIB (Page 5)
TEXT	Aurora Police and Aurora Fire Rescue will incorporate best practices into training developed while this Consent Decree is in effect, including greater use of scenario-based training tools in both of their academies and in-service training. The Departments shall confer with the Consent Decree Monitor as needed to meet this goal and will seek guidance and assistance from outside subject matter experts as appropriate.
TASK DESCRIPTION	The Monitor will determine if APD and AFR's training incorporates best practices and is using scenario-based training for both in-service and academy curriculum; that all training is consistent with revised policies; and, that APD and AFR are meeting the milestones as specified in the Consent Decree.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Use the Monitor's assessment of compliance from all mandates that require training development for APD and AFR including both academy and in-service training (for APD: 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 29, 30, 31, 37, 38, 39, 42, 67 for AFR: 31, 42) 2. Through the above assessments, confirm that all training curriculum has incorporated best practices and contains scenario-based training tools. 3. Through the above assessments, confirm if the CD required milestones have been achieved.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. Compliance is achieved on all mandates requiring training development and delivery (for APD: 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 29, 30, 31, 37, 38, 39, 42, 67 for AFR: 31, 42); and, 2. All CD related training content incorporates best practices and uses scenario-based training to a greater extent; 3. The APD and AFR have met the training milestones as specified in the Consent Decree.
REQUIRED DATA	Training syllabi and training plans from all relevant mandates; self-assessment from the APD and AFR
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Derivative from each new training
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandates 8, 12-15, 17-19, 29-31, 37-39, 42, and 67

MONITOR FORM(S)	Training Plan Assessment Form

TITLE	Incorporation of Best Practices and Scenario-based Training
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 5 at IIB (Page 5)
TEXT	When Aurora Police or Fire Rescue finalize a training plan identified in this Decree, they will share it with the Consent Decree Monitor and discuss whether the Monitor agrees that the training plan should be finalized. The Monitor will communicate its agreement or disagreement promptly, but absent a compelling reason, no more than 15 days from when it receives the proposed final version of training plan.
TASK DESCRIPTION	The Monitor will determine if APD and AFR have shared all training plans prior to finalizing.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Confirm through observations of training, discussions with training staff, and through the Monitor's assessments of all Mandates requiring training development (for APD : 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 29, 30, 31, 37, 38, 39, 42, 67 for AFR : 31, 42) that all training plans (course materials) related to Consent Decree requirements have been submitted to the Monitor prior to finalizing.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	1. Compliance with Mandate 5 will be achieved when compliance is achieved on all mandates requiring training development and delivery (for APD : 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 29, 30, 31, 37, 38, 39, 42, 67 for AFR : 31, 42) as those training plans will have been submitted to the Monitor prior to finalizing.
REQUIRED DATA	Training syllabi and training plans from all relevant mandates; self-assessment from the APD and AFR
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Derivative from each new training mandate
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandates 8, 12-15, 17-19, 29-31, 37-39, 42, and 67
MONITOR FORM(S)	Training Plan Assessment Form

SECTION III - BIAS POLICING

TITLE	Addressing Racial Bias in Policing – Objectives- Metrics
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 6 at III A (page 7)
TEXT	The City shall change, in measurable ways, how Aurora Police engages with all members of the community, including by reducing any racial disparities in how Aurora Police engages, arrests, and uses force in the community.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if APD has changed in measurable ways how it engages with all members of the community. Verify that APD has developed systems and processes designed to reduce racial/ethnic disparities which may be indicative or symptomatic of biased policing.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Confirm that the City has obtained Subject Matter Expert (SME) technical assistance to identify appropriate metrics and measurement to assess the level of change. 2. Review the APD's policies/processes developed to collect data in accordance with the SME's recommendations to confirm implementation. 3. Consult with the SME to determine the extent of change based on the measurements, in the APD's engagement with the community. 4. Consult with the SME to determine the extent of change based on the measurements, in racial/ethnic disparities of investigative encounters, arrests, and uses of force. 5. Consult with the SME to determine based on the measurements, whether racial/ethnic disparities are indicative or symptomatic of biased policing.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The APD has developed and implemented the policies/processes to collect data designed to measure the level of change if any in accordance with the SME's metrics and measurements; 2. According to the measurements, the APD has changed in a positive manner, how it engages with all members of the community; and, 3. The APD has identified ways to assist in the reduction of racial/ethnic disparities that may be indicative or symptomatic of biased policing in accordance to the SME's recommendations. 4. APD has measured whether these methodologies have actually assisted in reducing racial disparities indicative or symptomatic of biased policing.
REQUIRED DATA	TBD by the SME; self-assessment from the City or APD
SAMPLE REQUIRED	TBD by the SME

TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	RP3 for measures and metrics by the SME and periodic sampling as per those metrics TBD
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 16 at III D (1-3 a-b) (Page 10)
MONITOR FORM(S)	TBD

TITLE	Addressing Racial Bias in Policing – Objectives - Transparency
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 7 at III A (page 7)
TEXT	The City shall create full public transparency on how Aurora Police engages, arrests, and uses force in the community, including any racial disparities in these enforcement actions.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if Aurora has created a system of full transparency on how APD engages, arrests, and uses force in the community, including any racial/ethnic disparities in these enforcement actions.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Determine the appropriate data and findings from statistical analyses to be provided to the public. 2. Review the related policies/SOPs and confirm finalization and dissemination. 3. Determine the methods of publishing such data and findings to the public. 4. Verify that the APD is publishing such information in accordance with its policies/SOPs and applicable state law. 5. Review and evaluate the APD's internal review and accountability processes designed to ensure continued compliance.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The APD has developed the means to capture relevant data in accordance with applicable state law; 2. The APD has developed, finalized, disseminated and implemented appropriate policies/SOPs; 3. The APD periodically posts the relevant information on a public facing website; and, 4. The APD has developed and implemented an internal review process to ensure continued compliance.
REQUIRED DATA	TBD; self-assessment from the APD
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	RP 3 and updates through RP 12
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 16 at III D (1-3 a-b) (Page 10); Mandate 33 at V A (Page 17)
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Addressing Racial Bias in Policing – Objectives - Policies and Training
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 8 at III A (page 7)
TEXT	The City shall improve Aurora Police policies and training relevant to officer stops, arrests, and uses of force to give officers concrete guidance on how best to engage in critical decision-making and exercise discretion during community interactions, including by acknowledging the role that bias can play in enforcement decisions and developing strategies to combat bias.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if APD improved its policies and trainings relevant to officer stops, arrests, and uses of force to give officers concrete guidance on how best to engage in critical decision-making and exercise discretion during community interactions, including by acknowledging the role that bias can play in enforcement decisions and developing strategies to combat bias.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review the most recent policies related to stops/contacts, arrests, and UOF to determine if adequate guidance on critical decision-making and exercising discretion during community interactions is included. 2. Review the most recent training curriculum related to stops/contacts, arrests, and UOF to determine if adequate guidance on critical decision-making and exercising discretion during community interactions is provided. 3. In both above policies and training content, confirm the presence of verbiage acknowledging the role that bias can play in enforcement decisions, and the inclusion of strategies to combat bias. Note that the implementation of policies, training delivery, and internal review components are assessed under different mandates.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The APD's policies related to stops/contacts, arrests, and UOF provide adequate guidance on critical decision-making and exercising discretion during community interactions; 2. The APD's training content related to stops/contacts, arrests, and UOF provides adequate guidance on critical decision-making and exercising discretion during community interactions; and, 3. The above policies and training content contain verbiage acknowledging the role that bias can play in enforcement decisions, and includes strategies to combat bias.
REQUIRED DATA	Revised policies, training curriculum, observations of trainings, self-assessment from APD

SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Derivative from each new policy and training; Bias Training Development Deadline- 365 days; Use of Force Policy Deadline- 270 days; Use of Force Policy Adoption Deadline-300 days; Use of Force Training Development Deadline – 365 days; Documentation of Contacts Policy Adoption Deadline – 90 days; Stops Policy Deadline – 120 days; Stops Policy Training Deadline – 180 days
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 9 at III B 2a (Page 8); Mandate 10 at III B 2b (Page 8); Mandate 11 at III B 3 a (Page 8); Mandate 12 at III C (1-4) (Page 9); Mandate 13 at III C (1-4) (Page 9); Mandate 14 at III C (1-4) (Page 9); Mandate 15 at III C (1-4) (Page 9); Mandate 34 at V B (1) (Page 17); Mandate 35 at V B (2)(a) (Page 18)
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Addressing Racial Bias in Policing – Policy Changes – Amendment of Existing Policies - Revision of Directive 8.32 (Biased-based policing)
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 9 at III B 2a (Page 8)
TEXT	Aurora Police will review and revise the following policies to prohibit discrimination based on protected class status and conform to the goals of the Consent Decree and applicable state and federal law, including by increasing the level of detail in the policy and providing examples of prohibited behavior: Directive 8.32 (Biased-based policing)
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if APD has reviewed and revised Directive 8.32 to adequately address prohibitions of discrimination based on protected class status. Determine if the policy conforms to the goals of the Consent Decree, including reducing racial/ethnic disparities are indicative or symptomatic of biased policing, and applicable state law as defined in CRS 24-31-209 and federal law. Determine if the policy provides examples of prohibited behavior.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review Directive 8.32 to confirm that the policy adequately addresses prohibitions of discrimination based on protected class status. 2. Determine if the policy conforms to the goals of the Consent Decree, including reducing racial/ethnic disparities are indicative or symptomatic of biased policing, and applicable state law as defined in CRS 24-31-209 and federal law. 3. Determine if the policy provides examples of prohibited behavior. 4. Verify that the policy was finalized and disseminated.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The APD has revised Directive 8.32 to prohibit discrimination based on protected class status; 2. The revised directive conforms to the goals of the Consent Decree, including reducing racial/ethnic disparities that are indicative or symptomatic of biased policing, and applicable state law as defined in CRS 24-31-209 and federal law; 3. The directive includes examples of prohibited behavior; and, 4. APD has finalized and disseminated the directive. Note that the training content and delivery, implementation and internal review components of this mandate are assessed under separates mandates within this section.

REQUIRED DATA	Revised Directive 8.32; PowerDMS dissemination records; roster; self-assessment from the APD
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	RP 3
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 1 at II (Page 4); Mandate 2 at II A (Page 4); Mandate 3 at IIA (Page 4); Mandate 8 at III A (page 7); Mandate 34 at V B (1) (Page 17); Mandate 35 at V B (2)(a) (Page 18); Mandate 36 at V (2)(b) (Page 18)
MONITOR FORM(S)	TBD

TITLE	Addressing Racial Bias in Policing – Policy Changes – Amendment of Existing Policies - Revision of Directive 6.01 (Arrest Procedure)
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 10 at III B 2b (Page 8)
TEXT	Aurora Police will review and revise the following policies to prohibit discrimination based on protected class status and conform to the goals of the Consent Decree and applicable state and federal law, including by increasing the level of detail in the policy and providing examples of prohibited behavior: Directive 6.01 (Arrest Procedure)
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if APD has reviewed and revised Directives 6.01 to adequately address prohibitions of discrimination based on protected class status. Determine if the policy conforms to the goals of the Consent Decree, including reducing racial/ethnic disparities are indicative or symptomatic of biased policing, and applicable state law as defined in CRS 24-31-209 and federal law. Determine if the policy provides examples of prohibited behavior.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review Directive 6.01 to assess whether the policy adequately addresses prohibitions of discrimination based on protected class status. 2. Evaluate the policy as compared to the goals of the Consent Decree, including racial/ethnic disparities are indicative or symptomatic of biased policing, and applicable state law as defined in CRS 24-31-209 and federal law. 3. Confirm that the policy provides examples of prohibited behavior. 4. Verify that the policy was finalized and disseminated.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The APD has revised Directive 6.01 to prohibit discrimination based on protected class status; 2. The revised directive conforms to the goals of the Consent Decree, including reducing racial/ethnic disparities that are indicative or symptomatic of biased policing, and applicable state law as defined in CRS 24-31-209 and federal law; 3. The directive includes examples of prohibited behavior; and 4. The APD has finalized and disseminated the directive. Note that the training content and delivery, implementation and internal review components of this mandate are assessed under separates mandates within this section.

REQUIRED DATA	Draft of the revised policy; PowerDMS dissemination record; roster; self-assessment from APD
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	RP 3
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 1 at II (Page 4); Mandate 2 at II A (Page 4); Mandate 3 at IIA (Page 4); Mandate 8 at III A (page 7) Mandate 9 at III B 2a (Page 8); Mandate 34 at V B (1) (Page 17); Mandate 35 at V B (2)(a) (Page 18); Mandate 36 at V (2)(b) (Page 18)
MONITOR FORM(S)	TBD

TITLE	Addressing Racial Bias in Policing – Creation of New Policies - Stops
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 11 at III B 3 a (Page 8)
TEXT	Aurora Police will draft policies on the legal authority to make “stops,” more specifically detailed in Section V.B.2.a below. These policies will also provide specific, practical guidance intended to support officers in determining how to exercise their discretion when making stops.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if the policy APD developed to address the requirements at Mandate 35 at V.B.2.a., also provides specific, practical guidance intended to support officers in determining how to exercise their discretion when making stops.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Using the policy submitted by APD, and the Monitor’s compliance review under Mandate 35 at V.B.2.a, determine if the policy provides specific, practical guidance intended to support officers in determining how to exercise their discretion when making stops. 2. Use the Monitor’s compliance review for policy finalization and dissemination as reported for mandate Mandate 35 at V.B.2.a. 3. Use the Monitor’s compliance review for training of this policy as reported for Mandate 37 at V. C.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The APD has complied with Mandate 35 at V.B.2.a.; 2. The policy includes specific, practical guidance intended to support officers in determining how to exercise their discretion when making stops; The policy was finalized and disseminated to all appropriate APD staff as reported by the Monitor for Mandate 35 at V.B.2.a; and, 3. The APD has complied with the training requirements of this policy as reported for Mandate 37 at V. C. Note that implementation and internal review components of this mandate are assessed under separates mandates within this section.
REQUIRED DATA	Stops/contacts policies; Power DMS dissemination records; roster; self-assessment from the APD
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Stops Policy Deadline – 120 days; RP 2
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 1 at II (Page 4); Mandate 2 at II A (Page 4); Mandate 3 at IIA (Page 4); Mandate 8 at III A (page 7)

MONITOR FORM(S)	TBD

TITLE	Addressing Racial Bias in Policing – Training - Academy Training (Development)
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 12 at III C (1-4) (Page 9)
TEXT	Aurora Police will develop and provide comprehensive academy and in-service training to police personnel in the following areas assisted by outside subject-matter experts, as necessary: 1. bias; 2. deliberate decision making, including avoiding unnecessary escalation and teaching officers what they should do rather than what they can do; 3. recordkeeping requirements, including compliance with § 24-31-309(3.5); and, 4. specific articulation of the basis for encounters, including stops and uses of force.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if APD developed a sufficiently comprehensive academy training curriculum covering bias; deliberate decision making, including avoiding unnecessary escalation and teaching officers what they should do rather than what they can do; recordkeeping requirements, including compliance with § 24-31-309(3.5); and, specific articulation of the basis for encounters, including stops and uses of force.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	Review proposed Training Plan(s), including all materials, provided (curricula, syllabi, scenarios) and determine its sufficiency in addressing bias; deliberate decision making, including avoiding unnecessary escalation and teaching officers what they should do rather than what they can do; recordkeeping requirements, including compliance with § 24-31-309(3.5); and specific articulation of the basis for encounters, including stops and uses of force. Note the date that the developed training materials were completed.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The APD has developed a sufficient training plan(s) on: bias; deliberate decision making, including avoiding unnecessary escalation and teaching officers what they should do rather than what they can do; recordkeeping requirements, including compliance with § 24-31-309(3.5); and, specific articulation of the basis for encounters, including stops and uses of force; and, 2. The APD's training content is consistent with the revised policies on these topics and incorporates scenario-based training.

REQUIRED DATA	All associated training materials; self-assessment from the APD
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Bias Training – 365 days; RP 4
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 4 at IIB (Page 5); Mandate 8 at III A (page 7)
MONITOR FORM(S)	Training Plan Assessment Form

TITLE	Addressing Racial Bias in Policing – Training - Academy Training (Delivery)
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 13 at III C (1-4) (Page 9)
TEXT	Aurora Police will develop and provide comprehensive academy and in-service training to police personnel in the following areas assisted by outside subject-matter experts, as necessary: 1. bias; 2. deliberate decision making, including avoiding unnecessary escalation and teaching officers what they should do rather than what they can do; 3. recordkeeping requirements, including compliance with § 24-31-309(3.5); and, 4. specific articulation of the basis for encounters, including stops and uses of force.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if APD appropriately delivered the academy training as described and assessed by the Monitor under Mandate 12 at III C (1-4).
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review and observe the associated academy training delivery to assess adequacy and consistency with the Training submitted under Mandate 12 III C (1-4). 2. Determine the date that the training was delivered to all appropriate personnel.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The APD delivers the academy training consistent with the Monitor-approved training content submitted in response to Mandate 12 III C (1-4); and, 2. The APD has delivered the associated training to all appropriate academy recruits/attendees.
REQUIRED DATA	Training attendance records, roster, observations of the training; self-assessment from the APD
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Bias Training Completion – 720 days; RP 5, 7, 9, and 11
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 4 at IIB (Page 5); Mandate 8 at III A (page 7)
MONITOR FORM(S)	Training Evaluation Form

TITLE	Addressing Racial Bias in Policing – Training – In-Service Training (Development)
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 14 at III C (1-4) (Page 9)
TEXT	Aurora Police will develop and provide comprehensive in-service training to police personnel in the following areas assisted by outside subject-matter experts, as necessary: 1. bias; 2. deliberate decision making, including avoiding unnecessary escalation and teaching officers what they should do rather than what they can do; 3. recordkeeping requirements, including compliance with § 24-31-309(3.5); and, 4. specific articulation of the basis for encounters, including stops and uses of force.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if APD developed a sufficiently comprehensive in-service training curriculum covering bias; deliberate decision making, including avoiding unnecessary escalation and teaching officers what they should do rather than what they can do; recordkeeping requirements, including compliance with § 24-31-309(3.5); and, specific articulation of the basis for encounters, including stops and uses of force.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review proposed Training Plan(s), including all materials, provided (curricula, syllabi, scenarios) and determine its sufficiency in addressing bias; deliberate decision making, including avoiding unnecessary escalation and teaching officers what they should do rather than what they can do; recordkeeping requirements, including compliance with § 24-31-309(3.5); and specific articulation of the basis for encounters, including stops and uses of force. 2. Determine the date that the developed training materials were completed.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The APD has developed a sufficient in-service training plan(s) covering bias; deliberate decision making, including avoiding unnecessary escalation and teaching officers what they should do rather than what they can do; recordkeeping requirements, including compliance with § 24-31-309(3.5); and, specific articulation of the basis for encounters, including stops and uses of force; and,

	2. The APD's training content is consistent with the revised policies on these topics and incorporates scenario-based training.
REQUIRED DATA	All associated training materials; self-assessment from the APD
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Bias Training- 365 days; RP 3-4; every other RP thereafter
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 4 at IIB (Page 5); Mandate 8 at III A (page 7)
MONITOR FORM(S)	Training Plan Assessment Form

TITLE	Addressing Racial Bias in Policing – Training – In-Service Training (Delivery)
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 15 at III C (1-4) (Page 9)
TEXT	Aurora Police will develop and provide comprehensive academy and in-service training to police personnel in the following areas assisted by outside subject-matter experts, as necessary: 1. bias; 2. deliberate decision making, including avoiding unnecessary escalation and teaching officers what they should do rather than what they can do; 3. recordkeeping requirements, including compliance with § 24-31-309(3.5); and, specific articulation of the basis for encounters, including stops and uses of force.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if APD appropriately delivered the in-service training as described and assessed by the Monitor under Mandate 14 at III C (1-4).
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review and observe the associated in-service training delivery to assess adequacy and consistency with the Training submitted under Mandate 14 III C (1-4). 2. Determine the date that the training was delivered to all appropriate personnel.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The APD delivers the in-service training consistent with with the Monitor-approved training content submitted in response to Mandate 14 III C (1-4); and, 2. The APD has delivered the associated training to all appropriate in-service staff.
REQUIRED DATA	Attendance record at trainings and observations of training; self-assessment from the APD
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Bias Training Completion – 720 days; RP 5, 7, 9, and 11
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 4 at IIB (Page 5); Mandate 8 at III A (page 7)
MONITOR FORM(S)	Training Evaluation Form

TITLE	Addressing Racial Bias in Policing – Goals and Measurement
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 16 at III D (1-3 a-b) (Page 10)
TEXT	Aurora Police will develop metrics in consultation with the Consent Decree Monitor and outside experts to measure improvement in the areas described below. The Consent Decree Monitor will monitor compliance with this section and include updates on this item in their periodic updates to the Court. 1. Training provided on topics identified in this section; 2. Recordkeeping on police interactions; and, 3. Documentation and tracking of use-of-force incidents, including: a. Monitoring misdemeanor arrest outcomes and b. Tracking arrests and summons issued for particular offenses, such as “Failure to Obey a Lawful Order,” “Resisting Arrest,” “Criminal Trespass,” and related offenses.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if the APD has developed metrics to measure improvements in the relevant training; recordkeeping on police interactions; and, documentation and tracking of use-of-force incidents as required.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review and evaluate metrics to determine if they adequately measure improvements in the training developed in Mandates 12-15 Section III C (1-4); improvements in recordkeeping on police interactions in Mandate 36 Section V. B. 2. b; and, improvements in the documentation and tracking of use-of-force incidents in Mandate 32 Section IV E. 2.. 2. Confirm the metrics for UOF documentation and tracking include misdemeanor arrest outcomes and tracking arrests and summons for specified offenses. 3. Review related policies/SOPS to determine if they adequately address metric data collection procedures to measure improvements. 4. Verify that the policy was finalized and disseminated. 5. Review and evaluate the APD’s internal review and accountability processes designed to ensure continued compliance.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The APD has developed metrics to measure improvements relative to training developed in Mandates 12-15 at Section III C (104); recordkeeping on police interactions in Mandate 36 at Section V. B. 2. b; and, documentation and tracking of use of force incidents in Mandate 32 at Section IV E. 2. which need to include misdemeanor arrest outcomes, and UOF incidents involving arrests and summons issued for particular offenses

	including Failure to Obey a Lawful Order, Resisting Arrest and Criminal Trespass; 2. The APD has developed appropriate policies/SOP to adequately address metric data collection and measurement of improvements; and, 3. The APD has finalized and disseminated the policies/SOPs. 4. The APD has implemented sufficient internal review and accountability processes designed to ensure continued compliance.
REQUIRED DATA	Metrics TBD, related policies/SOPs, PowerDMS dissemination records, roster, self-assessment from the APD
SAMPLE REQUIRED	TBD
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	RP1: A baseline of current training provided on recordkeeping on police interactions; and documentation and tracking of use-of-force incidents, including monitoring misdemeanor arrest outcomes and tracking arrests and summons issued for particular offenses, such as "Failure to Obey a Lawful Order," "Resisting Arrest," "Criminal Trespass," and related offenses. RP2-RP12: On-going review and analysis relative to the effectiveness of changes to the metrics above.
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 6 at III A (page 7)
MONITOR FORM(S)	

SECTION IV – USE OF FORCE

TITLE	Use of Force - Objectives – Policies and Training
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 17 at IV A (Page 11)
TEXT	The City shall create improved policies and training to better equip officers to handle challenging situations in ways that reduce the use of force [UOF], ensure force is used in compliance with state and federal law, protect officer and community safety, and build a culture of continuous improvement.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if all new or revised APD policies and trainings relevant to UOF better equip officers to handle challenging situations in ways that reduce the need to use force when possible; ensure that when force is used, it is in compliance with state and federal law; protect officer and community safety; and, build a culture of continuous improvement.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Determine compliance with this Mandate by using the Monitor’s compliance determinations from Mandates 18-32. 2. Evaluate the APD’s UOF policies as a whole to assess if they better equip officers to handle challenging situations in ways that: • reduce the need to use force when possible and adequately explains and emphasizes de-escalation; • ensure that when force is used, it is in compliance with state and federal law and promotes the concept of least amount of force used even if more is legally justified; • protect officer and community safety as top priorities; and, • build a culture of continuous improvement through incident review, critique, feedback, and the implementation of remedial or revised training techniques when needed.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The APD has achieved compliance with all of the policy and training requirements in Mandates 18-32; and, 2. The Monitor determines that when viewed as a whole, the APD’s policies and training better equip officers to handle challenging situations in ways that: • reduce the need to use force when possible and adequately explains and emphasizes de-escalation; • ensure that when force is used, it is in compliance with state and federal law and promotes the concept of least amount of force used even if more force is legally justified; • protect officer and community safety as priorities; and,

	build a culture of continuous improvement through incident review, critique, feedback, and the implementation of remedial or revised training techniques when needed.
REQUIRED DATA	Revised policies and training lesson plans/curricula, training attendance records, observations of training and UOF reviews, self-assessment from APD; PowerDMS dissemination records, roster
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Derivative from each new policy and training; Use of Force Policy Deadline -270 days; Use of Force Policy Adoption Deadline- 300 days; Use of Force Training Development Deadline- 365 days; Use of Force Training Completion Deadline- 540 days
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 1 at II (Page 4); Mandate 2 at II A (Page 4); Mandate 3 at IIA (Page 4); Mandate 4 at IIB (Page 5); Mandate 5 at IIB (Page 5); Mandate 18 at IV A (Page 11); Mandate 21 at IV B (1) (Page 11); Mandate 22 at IV B (2) (Page 12); Mandate 23 at IV B (3) (Page 13); Mandate 29 at IV D (1) (Page 15); Mandate 30 at IV D (2) (Page 16); Mandate 31 at IV D (3) (Page 16)
MONITOR FORM(S)	TBD

TITLE	Use of Force - Objectives – Culture of De-escalation
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 18 at IV A (Page 11)
TEXT	The City shall create a culture of enforcement that prioritizes de-escalation when possible in accordance with Colorado law, but does not compromise officer safety when force must be used.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if the City has created a culture of enforcement that prioritizes de-escalation when possible in accordance with Colorado law, but does not compromise officer safety when force must be used.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review policies, training, and accountability mechanisms (e.g., supervisor reviews, Force Review Boards (FRB), to identify any areas that need to prioritize de-escalation more clearly without compromising officer safety. 2. Review UOF incidents to identify any scenarios where officers could have employed de-escalation techniques without compromising officer safety. 3. When/if scenarios are identified, determine if the reviewing entity (supervisor, command staff, and/or the FRB) also identified those issues, confirm that those issues were formally (i.e. documented) communicated back to the appropriate command staff, training, and the involved officer(s).
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. APD's policies, training, and accountability measures prioritize de-escalation whenever possible; 2. UOF incidents indicate that officers employ de-escalation techniques whenever possible, without compromising officer safety; and, 3. When scenarios within a use of force indicate that de-escalation techniques could have been, but were not employed, the reviewing entity (supervisor, command staff, and/or the FRB) identified, documented and formally communicated those issues back to the appropriate command staff, training, and the involved officer(s).
REQUIRED DATA	UOF policies, training, accountability measures, UOF incidents and associated reviews (supervisor, command staff, FRB); self-assessment from APD
SAMPLE REQUIRED	TBD
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	RP3 and continuing throughout the term of the Decree.
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 1 at II (Page 4); Mandate 2 at II A (Page 4); Mandate 3 at IIA (Page 4); Mandate 4 at IIB (Page 5); Mandate 5 at IIB (Page 5); Mandate 18 at IV A (Page

	11); Mandate 21 at IV B (1) (Page 11); Mandate 22 at IV B (2) (Page 12); Mandate 23 at IV B (3) (Page 13); Mandate 29 at IV D (1) (Page 15); Mandate 30 at IV D (2) (Page 16); Mandate 31 at IV D (3) (Page 16); Mandate 19 at IV A (Page 11)
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Use of Force - Objectives – Accountability Measures
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 19 at IV A (Page 11)
TEXT	The City shall improve and develop accountability measures that consistently identify excessive uses of force, situations where force should not have been used even if it was legal, and recurring training and tactical issues related to use of force.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if the APD has improved and/or developed accountability measures that consistently identify excessive uses of force, situations where force should not have been used even if it was legal, and recurring training and tactical issues related to use of force.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review all associated policies and observe where possible, APD's accountability measures (e.g., supervisory/command level UOF reviews, FRB UOF reviews, adjudicated complaint investigations of excessive or inappropriate force used, disciplinary outcomes, and the early intervention system and processes) to determine if instances of excessive force; situations where force or the level of force should not have been used even though it was legally justified; and, recurring department-wide or individual officer training and/or tactical issues related to use of force are being consistently identified by APD. 2. Confirm policies were finalized and disseminated. 3. Determine if APD provided appropriate APD personnel with training/orientation on policies. 4. Determine if the associated policies are being adhered to during such reviews and/or investigations. 5. Determine if appropriate remediation measures were initiated when necessary.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The APD has developed and/or improved its accountability mechanisms (e.g., supervisory/command level UOF reviews, FRB UOF reviews, adjudicated complaints of excessive or inappropriate force used, disciplinary outcomes, and the early intervention system and processes) to consistently identify instances of excessive uses of force, situations where force or the level of force used, should not have been used even though it was legally justified, and recurring department-wide or individual officer training and/or tactical issues related to use of force; 2. APD's accountability mechanism processes are formalized/documentated within its policies/SOP/directives; 3. The APD finalized and disseminated its policies to all appropriate personnel;

	4. The APD delivers training/orientation covering the above policies to all appropriate staff; 5. The APD has implemented the related policies/SOPs/directives; and, 6. The APD ensures that appropriate remediation measures have been initiated when necessary.
REQUIRED DATA	UOF and associated reviews (supervisor, command, FRB), complaint investigations, reviews of UOF, FRB packages and minutes, Early Intervention System data, PowerDMS dissemination records, training attendance records, associated arrest data, self-assessment from APD
SAMPLE REQUIRED	TBD
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	RP1: A baseline of current accountability mechanisms and a determination as to what extent the mechanisms consistently identify excessive force, situations where force should not have been used even if it was legal and understanding as to whether there is recurring training relative to tactical issues related to force. RP2-RP12: On-going review and analysis relative to the effectiveness of changes to accountability measures.
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 18 at IV A (Page 11)
MONITOR FORM(S)	Monitor UOF Review Form(s)

TITLE	Use of Force - Objectives - Culture of Coordination and Collaboration Between APD and AFR
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 20 at IV A (Page 11)
TEXT	The City shall create a culture of collaboration between Aurora Police and Aurora Fire Rescue that is coordinated and emphasizes public safety.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if APD and AFR collaboratively develop policies and address issues where both APD and AFR are affected/involved in public safety matters. Determine if training is being conducted to ensure a coordinated responses between APD and AFR and that officers and firefighters are being held accountable for violations of those policies.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Attend any meetings in which APD and AFR are collaborating to address common issues. 2. Observe and/or review curriculum of any mutual APD and AFR trainings when conducted to cover coordinated responses. 3. Review incidents wherein APD and AFR responded to evaluate whether officers and firefighters are working together. 4. Review Early Intervention System data to determine if APD and AFR personnel are being held accountable for violations of cooperative policies. Note that policy and training components of this Mandate are assessed in other Mandates in this section.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. Both the APD and AFR have implemented methods to promote cooperative and collaborative processes between the APD and AFR to include joint meetings to address mutual issues and trainings covering coordinated responses; 2. Incidents involving both APD and AFR response do not indicate a lack of coordinated response; and, 3. APD and AFR personnel are held accountable for violations of cooperative policies.
REQUIRED DATA	List of mutual meetings, trainings that cover mutual response, historical data of incidents in which both APD and AFR responded, BWC footage of selected incidents; relevant APD and AFR policies and directives; self-assessment from the City (or APD and AFR); PowerDMS dissemination records, AFR policy dissemination process
SAMPLE REQUIRED	TBD

TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	RP1: Baseline describing current state of collaboration between APD and AFR and RP2 through 12
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 1 at II (Page 4); Mandate 2 at II A (Page 4); Mandate 3 at IIA (Page 4); Mandate 4 at IIB (Page 5); Mandate 5 at IIB (Page 5)
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Use of Force- Policy Changes
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 21 at IV B (1) (Page 11)
TEXT	Aurora Police will adopt the policies recommended by the [Crime and Justice Institute (CJI)] review or, if it seeks to change the policies or not adopt them, confer with the Consent Decree Monitor on its desire to do so and provide alternate policies that address the use of force issues in the Report by the Use of Force Policy Adoption Deadline.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if the APD either adopted the CJI and/or appropriate subject matter expert (SME) recommended policies, or in the alternative, consulted with the Monitor relative to alternative policies. If needed, consult with APD and/or CJI and/or SME in the development or revision of the policies.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review the policies submitted by the APD in response to this mandate and compare to the CJI and/or SME recommendations. 2. Assess the submitted policies to determine if the policies address the UOF issues raised in the Attorney General's (AG) report. 3. Determine the date the policies are finalized and disseminated. Note that implementation, training and internal review and accountability components are assessed in other mandates.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The APD has adopted the recommendations of the CJI and/or SME, or in the alternative, after consultation with the monitor, adopts alternative policies that address the UOF issues detailed in the AG's report; and, 2. The policies have finalized and disseminated.
REQUIRED DATA	Use of force policies submitted in response to this mandate, CJI's recommendations, AG's report, PowerDMS dissemination records; self-assessment from the APD
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Use of Force Policy Deadline -270 days; Use of Force Policy Adoption Deadline-300 days; RP3-4
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 1 at II (Page 4); Mandate 2 at II A (Page 4); Mandate 3 at IIA (Page 4); Mandate 17 at IV A (Page 11); Mandate 18 at IV A (Page 11)

MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Use of Force - Amendment of Existing Policies
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 22 at IV B (2) (Page 12)
TEXT	The City, assisted by the Crime and Justice Institute, as appropriate, will review, investigate, and make the appropriate changes, if any, to these policies: - Directive 5.03 (Use of Physical and Deadly Force) - Directive 5.04 (Reporting and Investigating the Use of Tools, Weapons and Physical Force) - Directive 6.13 (Dealing with Persons with Mental Health Disorders) - Directive 9.06 (Coordination with Aurora Fire Rescue and Emergency Medical Services) In addition, this review shall include limiting the use of force in response to low-level offenses such as “failure to obey a lawful order” or “pedestrian failing to yield.”
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if the APD has reviewed, investigated and made appropriate changes to Directives 5.03, 5.04 6.13, and 9.06 as recommended by CJI and/or appropriate Subject Matter Expert (SME). Determine if the above directives have been appropriately revised to limit the use of force in response to low level offenses such as “Failure to obey a lawful order” or “Pedestrian failing to yield.”
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	- Review policies submitted in response to this mandate (Directives 5.03, 5.04, 6.13, and 9.06) to confirm that CJI and/or SME recommended revisions have been made or addressed. - Review the above directives to determine if they appropriately limit the use of force in response to low-level offenses such as “failure to obey a lawful order” or “pedestrian failing to yield.” - Confirm all policies/directives have been finalized and disseminated to appropriate APD personnel. Note that implementation, training and internal review and accountability components are assessed in other mandates.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: - The APD Directives 5.03, 5.04, 6.13, and 9.06, are revised as recommended by CJI and/or an SME; - The directives appropriately limit the use of force in response to low-level offenses such as “failure to obey a lawful order” or “pedestrian failing to yield”; and, - The APD has finalized and disseminated policies to appropriate personnel.

REQUIRED DATA	Use of force policies (Directives 5.03, 5.04, 6.13, and 9.06), CJI and/or SME's recommendations; PowerDMS dissemination records; roster; self-assessment from the APD
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Use of Force Policy Deadline -270 days; Use of Force Policy Adoption Deadline-300 days; RP 3-4
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 1 at II (Page 4); Mandate 2 at II A (Page 4); Mandate 3 at IIA (Page 4); Mandate 17 at IV A (Page 11); Mandate 18 at IV A (Page 11)
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Use of Force - Creation of New Policies
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 23 at IV B (3) (Page 13)
TEXT	The City shall create policy, procedure, or other directive to facilitate the development of a comprehensive joint coordination policy between Aurora Police and Aurora Fire Rescue.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if the City (APD <u>and</u> AFR) has created policy, procedure, or other directive to facilitate the development of a comprehensive joint coordination policy between Aurora Police and Aurora Fire Rescue.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review the policies, procedures, or other directives submitted by the APD and the AFR and determine if it is comprehensive and adequately addresses joint coordination between APD and AFR. Determine if the policy and/or SOPs include clear delineation of both APD and AFR responsibilities and contain verbiage to clarify the boundaries of each role. 2. Determine if the above policies were finalized and disseminated to all appropriate APD and AFR personnel. 3. Determine if the APD and AFR have implemented the above policies by reviewing incidents where both APD and AFR responded. Note that training and internal review and accountability components are assessed in other mandates.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The City (or APD and AFR individually) have developed policies, procedures, or directives that are considered comprehensive and that adequately address joint coordination policy between APD and AFR; 2. The policy and/or SOPs include clear delineation of both APD and AFR responsibilities and contains verbiage to clarify the boundaries of each role. 3. The APD and AFR have finalized and disseminated the above policies to all appropriate APD and AFR personnel; and 4. The APD and AFR have implemented the above policies.
REQUIRED DATA	APD and AFR policies, procedures, and directives; policy dissemination records from both APD (PowerDMS) and AFR (Vector Solutions); rosters from APD and AFR; self-assessment from the City/APD/AFR
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A

TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Use of Force Policy Deadline -270 days; Use of Force Policy Adoption Deadline-300 days; RP 3-4
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 1 at II (Page 4); Mandate 2 at II A (Page 4); Mandate 3 at IIA (Page 4); Mandate 17 at IV A (Page 11); Mandate 18 at IV A (Page 11)
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Use of Force – Force Review Board (Recent Changes)
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 24 at IV C (Page 13)
TEXT	Since the Attorney General began the Pattern & Practice investigation, Aurora Police has already made several changes to the Force Review Board. These changes include: 1) adding a standardized process to review each use of force, 2) placing commanders at the academy on the Force Review Board to allow for more immediate feedback on training, 3) including commanders in the Force Review Board discussion of force incidents from that commander's unit, 4) requiring commanders to follow up on training and tactical issues identified by the Force Review Board with the patrol officers in each district, and 5) adding legal counsel to the Force Review Board. If Aurora Police seeks to reverse any of the recent changes discussed in this section, it must first discuss those proposed changes with the Consent Decree Monitor following the process in Section II.A.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if the recent changes to the Force Review Board (FRB) process as described in Section IV C 1-5 continue to be utilized. If APD seeks to reverse any of these changes, confirm appropriate consultation with the Consent Decree Monitor regarding the proposed changes occurred.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review the FRB written policy to determine if changes described in Section IV C 1-5 continue to be part of the process. 2. If APD changes or reverses any of those processes, assess for appropriateness. 3. Confirm the FRB policy was finalized and disseminated. 4. Observe random weekly FRB meetings to assess and determine if the revisions described in Section IV C 1-5 continue to be utilized.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The APD has retained the processes described in Section IV C 1-5 relative to the Force Review Board; 2. The APD has documented policy that describe the FRB process that include those described in Section IV C 1-5; 3. To the extent that any revisions are made to the FRB process, the Monitor was consulted pursuant to Section IIA; 4. The APD finalized and disseminated the policy to all appropriate personnel; and, 5. The FRB continues to follow its policy relative to the FRB.

REQUIRED DATA	Force Review Board written policy; observations of Force Review Board reviews; PowerDMS dissemination records, roster; self-assessment from APD
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Force Review Board Process Improvement Deadline – 120 days; RP 2 and on-going in to-be-designated RPs.
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Use of Force - Changes to Process (Feedback for Training)
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 25 at IV C (1)(1) (Page 14)
TEXT	In addition to these changes, the Force Review Board will, by the Force Review Board Process Improvement Deadline, modify its procedures or policies to: 1. formalize the process of giving feedback from the Force Review Board to those in charge of academy and in-service training, District Commanders, and Aurora Fire Rescue in incidents where no policy violation occurred but practices can be improved. Once the new Use of Force Policies discussed above are implemented, the Force Review Board shall promptly update its procedures or policies to evaluate use of force incidents against the updated policies, working with the Consent Decree Monitor on both policies and procedures under Section II.A.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if the FRB process for providing feedback from the result of a FRB to those in charge of academy and in-service training, District Commanders, and AFR in incidents where no policy violation occurred but practices could be improved is described within the policy. Determine cases where no violation occurred but where practices could be improved and verify that FRB appropriately identified areas those issues and communicated its findings in compliance with FRB policy. Determine if the FRB updated its policy consistent with any revisions to APD's UOF policy. Determine in consultation with a SME, if any additional changes or modifications should be made to the operations of the Force Review Board to further the objectives of the Consent Decree. To the extent that such changes or modifications are determined to be necessary, that such changes or modifications are implemented through policy.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review the FRB policy to determine if the FRB has appropriately formalized the process of providing feedback resulting from an FRB review to all appropriate command staff including academy and in-service training, District Commanders, and AFR related to incidents where no policy violation occurred but practices could be improved. 2. Determine if FRB policy was finalized and disseminated. 3. Identify cases where no violation occurred, and independently determine if practices could be improved. Once identified, determine if those improvements were identified by the FRB and communicated in compliance with the FRB policy.

	4. Assess the FRB operation and process to determine if improvements are needed.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The APD revised or developed documented policy detailing the FRB's process of providing feedback resulting from FRB's reviews, to all appropriate training, command, and to AFR of incidents where no policy violation occurred but practices could be improved; 2. The APD has and continues to update its FRB policy to be consistent with the APD's UOF policy; 3. The APD finalized and disseminated the FRB policy to all appropriate personnel; and, 4. The APD's FRB appropriately identified areas where practices could be improved in cases where no violation occurred and has communicated those findings consistent with FRB policy.
REQUIRED DATA	FRB policies, observations of FRB reviews, FRB minutes, independent evaluation of use of force incidents; self-assessment from APD; PowerDMS; roster
SAMPLE REQUIRED	TBD
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Force Review Board Process Improvement Deadline – 120 days; 120 days; RP 2 and ongoing in to-be designated RPs.
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Use of Force - Changes to Process (Review in Context)
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 26 at IV C (1)(2) (Page 14)
TEXT	In addition to these changes, the Force Review Board will, by the Force Review Board Process Improvement Deadline, modify its procedures or policies to: 2. review each instance of force used in the context of the overall encounter, including the circumstances leading to its use and the mental capacity of the suspect,
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if the FRB modified its policies to require an evaluation of each instance when force is used in the context of the overall encounter including the circumstances leading to its use and, an evaluation of the mental capacity of the suspect based on the information presented by the investigator.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review the FRB policy to determine if they specify the review of each use of force in the context of the overall encounter including the circumstances leading to its use, and an evaluation of the mental health of the subject. 2. Observe weekly FRB operations and resulting documentation (minutes), to determine if uses of force are being evaluated as required.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The APD has updated its FRB policy to require that each instance of force used be reviewed in the context of the overall encounter, including the circumstances leading to its use and, an to include evaluation of the mental capacity of the suspect based on information presented by the investigator; and, 2. The APD's FRB is consistently reviewing each instance of force based on its policy.
REQUIRED DATA	FRB policies, observations of FRB reviews, FRB minutes, independent evaluation of use of force incidents; self-assessment from APD
SAMPLE REQUIRED	TBD
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Force Review Board Process Improvement Deadline – 120 days; 120 days; RP 2 and ongoing in to be designated RPs
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Use of Force - Changes to Process (Measurement of Uses of Force)
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 27 at IV C (1)(3) (Page 14)
TEXT	In addition to these changes, the Force Review Board will, by the Force Review Board Process Improvement Deadline, modify its procedures or policies to: 3. develop reliable ways to measure the frequency of use of force, compliance with policy, injuries to subjects, the safety of officers, mental health holds, and any other relevant measures of improvement.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if the FRB developed reliable ways to measure the frequency of UOF, compliance with policy, injuries to subjects, the safety of officers, the use of mental health holds to detain persons, and any other relevant measures of improvement.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review FRB policy, designed data collection mechanisms to determine if they adequately measure frequency of UOF, compliance with policy, injuries to subjects, the safety of officers, the use of mental health holds to detain persons. 2. Determine if any, other relevant measures of improvement that should be included. 3. Observe FRB operations and resulting documentation (minutes), to determine if the above required information is collected, and the frequency of occurrence is utilized during the review process.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The APD has developed appropriate policies, procedures and data collection methods to implement reliable ways to measure the frequency of UOF, compliance with policy, injuries to subjects, the safety of officers, the use of mental health holds to detain persons, and any other relevant measures of improvement; and, 2. The APD's FRB is utilizing the above information and detail during its review of force consistent with its policy.
REQUIRED DATA	FRB policies, observations of FRB reviews, FRB minutes, independent evaluation of use of force incidents; self-assessment from the APD.
SAMPLE REQUIRED	TBD

TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Force Review Board Process Improvement Deadline – 120 days; 120 days; RP 2 and ongoing in to-be-determined RPs
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Use of Force – Collaboration with Academy and Other Sections
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 28 at IV C (2) (Page 15)
TEXT	A member of the academy staff now serves on the Force Review Board and the member's expertise in training is used in the evaluation of use of force cases and the member's experience on the Force Review Board informs the development of training. Recently, Aurora Police developed guidance on the use of body-worn camera video shown to the Force Review Board in recruit and in-service training classes at the academy. The videos selected will include both successful use of de-escalation and other techniques by Aurora police officers, and videos of incidents where improvement is recommended or needed.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Confirm that the following adopted practices have been formalized in FRB and Training policies and continue to be implemented: 1. a member of the academy staff serves on the FRB; 2. the academy member's expertise in training is used in the evaluation of UOF cases. 3. the academy member's experience on the FRB is used in the development of training. 4. Body-Worn Camera (BWC) footage shown during FRB reviews is used in recruit and in-service training classes at the academy; videos selected include both successful use of de-escalation, other techniques by APD officers, and, videos of incidents where improvement is recommended or needed.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review FRB's policy to determine if the above processes are included. 2. Observe FRB operations and resulting documentation (minutes), to determine if the academy staff member's experience and expertise is being utilized to evaluate UOF incidents. 3. During observations of FRBs, note any instances identified where the need for developed or revised training was identified during the FRB. 4. Review related UOF training curricula to determine if it was incorporated appropriately. 5. Observe both academy and in-service training to determine if appropriate BWC footage is being utilized.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The APD updates its FRB and Training policies to include the following: a) a member of the academy staff serves on the FRB; b) the academy member's expertise in training is used in the evaluation of UOF cases.

	c) the academy member's experience on the FRB is used in the development of training. d) Body-Worn Camera (BWC) footage shown during FRB reviews is used in recruit and in-service training classes at the academy; videos selected include both successful use of de-escalation, other techniques by APD officers, and, videos of incidents where improvement is recommended or needed; and, 2. The APD's FRB and Training staff continue to implement the above practices consistent with its policies.
REQUIRED DATA	FRB policies, observations of FRB reviews, FRB minutes, independent evaluation of use of force incidents, training curriculum, BWC footage; self-assessment from the APD
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Force Review Board Process Improvement Deadline – 120 days; 120 days; RP 2 and ongoing in to-be-determined RPs
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Use of Force – Training (Scenario-based training)
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 29 at IV D (1) (Page 15)
TEXT	Aurora Police will ensure that the training described below is provided and delivered promptly, no later than the Use of Force Training Development Deadline. 1. Scenario-based training Aurora Police will train substantially all the police personnel who interact with the public by the Use of Force Training Completion Deadline.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if APD's UOF training curriculum includes appropriate scenario-based training. Determine if all appropriate APD personnel have completed the training.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review training materials to confirm the presence of appropriate scenario-based UOF training. 2. Attend in-person training and assess for consistency with reviewed training materials. 3. Review attendance records compared to department roster to determine if all appropriate staff have completed the training. Note the date the training delivery is completed.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The APD's UOF training materials include appropriate scenario-based training techniques; and, 2. All appropriate APD personnel have completed the training.
REQUIRED DATA	Training lesson plans/curricula; attendance record at trainings; roster; observations of trainings; self-assessment from the City
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Use of Force Training Development Deadline- 365 days; Use of Force Training Completion Deadline – 540 days; RP 5-6 and every other RP thereafter
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Use of Force – Training (De-escalation training)
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 30 at IV D (2) (Page 16)
TEXT	Aurora Police will ensure that the training described below is provided and delivered promptly, no later than the Use of Force Training Development Deadline. 2. De-escalation
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if APD's UOF training includes the concept of de-escalation.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review training materials and to confirm the presence of de-escalation concepts. 2. Attend in-person training and assess for consistency with reviewed training materials. 3. Review attendance records compared to department roster to determine if all appropriate staff have completed the training. Note the date the training delivery is completed.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The APD's UOF training materials includes scenario-based training techniques; and, 2. All appropriate APD personnel have completed the training.
REQUIRED DATA	Training lesson plans/curricula; attendance record at trainings and observations of trainings; self-assessment from APD
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Use of Force Training Development Deadline- 365 days; Use of Force Training Completion Deadline – 540 days; RP 5-6 and every other RPs thereafter
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Use of Force – Training (Joint APD and AFR Training)
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 31 at IV D (3) (Page 16)
TEXT	Aurora Police will ensure that the training described below is provided and delivered promptly, no later than the Use of Force Training Development Deadline. 3. Joint police and fire training on scene coordination, as appropriate. [Text repeated for context]... Aurora Police will train substantially all the police personnel who interact with the public by the Use of Force Training Completion Deadline.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if APD's UOF training plan includes joint police and fire on scene coordination as appropriate.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review APD's UOF training materials and confirm the presence of joint APD and AFR on-scene coordination where appropriate. 2. Attend in-person training to assess for consistency with reviewed training materials. 3. Review attendance records to ensure all appropriate APD and AFR staff have completed the training. Note the date the training delivery is completed.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The APD UOF training materials developed includes joint APD and AFR on-scene coordination when appropriate; 2. All appropriate APD personnel have completed the training; and, 3. All appropriate AFR personnel have completed the training.
REQUIRED DATA	Training lesson plans/curricula; attendance record at trainings, observations of trainings; self-assessment from the City (or APD and AFR)
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Use of Force Training Development Deadline- 365 days; Use of Force Training Completion Deadline – 540 days; RP 5-6 and every other RP thereafter
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Use of Force – Goals and Measurement
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 32 at IV E (Page 16)
TEXT	Aurora Police, in consultation with the Consent Decree Monitor and outside experts, will develop metrics to measure improvement in the areas listed below by the Use of Force Metrics Deadline. The Consent Decree Monitor will monitor compliance with this section and include updates on this item in the periodic reports to the Court. The metrics will include at least the following: 1. Participation in ABLE, crisis intervention and other voluntary trainings 2. Number and type of use-of-force incidents, and 3. Community and officer complaints.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if the APD developed metrics to measure improvements in the following areas: 1. Participation in ABLE, crisis intervention and other voluntary trainings, 2. The number and type of use-of-force incidents, and, 3. Community and officer complaints including any resultant disciplinary action.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review proposed metrics and determine if they will adequately measure improvements in the above areas. 2. Provide input as needed to finalize metrics including frequency of measurements. 3. Determine when the metrics were finalized. 4. Provide updates on above in periodic reports to the Court.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when the APD has developed metrics to measure improvements in the following areas: 1. Participation in ABLE, crisis intervention and other voluntary trainings, 2. The number and type of use-of-force incidents, and, 3. Community and officer complaints
REQUIRED DATA	Access to metrics data collection system, Early Intervention System, UOF incidents, Complaints, including any related disciplinary actions; self-assessment from the City or APD
SAMPLE REQUIRED	TBD

TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Use of Force Metrics Deadline -150 days; RP 2 and ongoing in to-be-determined RPs
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	
MONITOR FORM(S)	

SECTION V – STOPS

TITLE	Documentation of Stops - Objectives
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 33 at V A (Page 17)
TEXT	The City shall develop a documentation system that complies with state law, allows for prompt and transparent review of officer behavior, and improves the ability of Aurora Police to identify successes and areas for improvement. The Parties recognize that recent legislative changes require a comprehensive update to the City's practices, which will take time to implement. The City will ensure that compliance with these statutes will occur within the time periods identified in this section.
MONITOR'S TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if the City has developed a documentation system for all "Contacts" as defined by Colorado Senate Bill (SB) 217 and that it contains all required information. Verify that the system permits prompt reviews of officer behavior and that the use of the data within the system has the potential for identifying successes and areas for improvement related to individual officers and/or policy updates or training opportunities.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review the documentation system to determine if all required stops/contacts information is present 2. Confirm that the required information has been provided to the DCJ, DPS for publication. 3. Determine if the system permits a prompt reviews of officer behavior. 4. Determine if the use of the data within the system has the potential for identifying successes and areas for improvement related to individual officers and/or policy updates or training opportunities.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The City has developed a documentation system for all stops/contacts as defined by CO SB 217 and contains all required information; 2. The requisite information has been provided to the DCJ, DPS for publication; 3. The system permits prompt reviews of officer behavior; and, 4. The data within the system has the potential for identifying successes and areas for improvement related to individual officers and/or policy updates or training opportunities. Note that the policy, training content and delivery, implementation and internal review components of this mandate are assessed under separates mandates within this section.

REQUIRED DATA	Documentation System for stops/contacts, stops/contacts data, self-assessment from APD including any analyses that demonstrates the APD's identification of successes and areas for improvement, BWC footage
SAMPLE REQUIRED	TBD
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	RP1: A baseline of the current documentation mechanisms and a determination as to what extent the mechanisms consistently comply with relevant state law. RP2-RP12: On-going review and analysis relative to the effectiveness of the documentation system.
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandates 34 at V B (1), 35 at V B (2)(a), and 36 at V (2)(b), 37 at V C, 38 at V D.
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Documentation of Stops – Policy Changes (General Principle)
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 34 at V B (1) (Page 17)
TEXT	Aurora Police will develop policies that comply with existing law as soon as practicable, and, in any event, no later than the Stops Policy Deadline. The City shall work to develop policies in a comprehensive manner that reduces the need for multiple trainings and policy updates. In addition to compliance with applicable law, the policies and platforms supporting the policies shall link information about officers involved with the stops to the required information about stops.
MONITOR'S TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if APD developed policies in compliance with existing Colorado state law. Determine if all related policies were developed, finalized and disseminated and training was delivered within a reasonably close timeframe. Determine if the related platforms [contacts documentation system] contains all required information and links all involved officers information to the connected contact.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review the policies to ensure compliance with applicable laws 2. Identify the date that the policies were finalized, disseminated. Determine the date of the associated training. 3. Review any associated newly developed or revised policies and determine when finalized and disseminated to evaluate the reasonableness of timing. 4. Review all related training date(s) to identify any significant gaps and evaluate the reasonableness of timing delivery. 5. Review the stops/contacts documentation system compared to contact data to confirm that information about all involved officers is linked to relevant contacts.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The APD has developed the policies in compliance with CO SB 217 2. The policy and platform (documentation system) links information about all involved officers to the relevant stops/contact; 3. The APD finalized and disseminated the policies. 4. The APD finalized and disseminated all related developed or revised policies within a reasonably close proximity as possible to one another; and, 5. The APD delivered related training within a reasonably close as possible timeframe. Note that the training content and delivery, implementation and internal review components of this mandate are assessed under separates mandates within this section.

REQUIRED DATA	All related policies to stops/contacts and related documentation system; PowerDMS dissemination records, roster; self-assessment from the APD
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Documentation System of Stop/Contacts deadline- 90 days; Stops Policy Deadline- 120 days; RP 1; RP 2
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandates 34 at V B (1), 35 at V B (2)(a), and 36 at V (2)(b), 37 at V C, 38 at V D. Mandate 2 at II A (Page 4); Mandate 3 at IIA (Page 4)
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Documentation of Stop – Policy Changes - Creation of New Policies (Legal Requirements for Stops)
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 35 at V B (2)(a) (Page 18)
TEXT	Aurora Police will create a new policy that provides specific guidance on legal requirements for the different types of stops that police officers make, including for “contacts,” “encounters,” “temporary detentions,” and “arrests.” This policy will cover both Colorado law and federal law, including, but not limited to, Terry v. Ohio, 392 U.S. 1 (1968).
MONITOR’S TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if APD developed a new policy that provides specific guidance on legal requirements for the different types of stops that police officers make, including for “contacts,” “encounters,” “temporary detentions,” and “arrests.” This policy will cover both Colorado law and federal law, including, but not limited to, Terry v. Ohio, 392 U.S. 1 (1968).
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review the policy to confirm it provides specific guidance as required, and covers all relevant state and federal laws. 2. Note the date the policy was finalized and disseminated.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The APD has developed a policy that provides specific guidance on the legal requirements for the different types of encounters that officers make; and, 2. The policy was disseminated to all appropriate APD staff. Note that the training content and delivery, implementation and internal review components of this mandate are assessed under separates mandates within this section.
REQUIRED DATA	Draft of the policy; PowerDMS dissemination records, roster, self-assessment from the APD
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Documentation System of Stops/Contacts - 90 days; Stops Policy Deadline- 120 days (June 16, 2022); RP 1; RP 2
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandates 34 at V B (1), 35 at V B (2)(a), and 36 at V (2)(b), 37 at V C, 38 at V D.Mandate 2 at II A (Page 4); Mandate 3 at IIA (Page 4)
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Documentation of Stops- Policy Changes – Creation of New Policies (Recordkeeping Requirements)
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 36 at V (2)(b) (Page 18)
TEXT	Aurora Police will create a new policy for implementing the data collection requirements of C.R.S. §§ 24-31-309(3.5) and 24-31-903.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if the APD created a new policy for implementing the data collection requirements of C.R.S. §§ 24-31-309(3.5) and 24-31-903.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review the policy to confirm it complies with the requirements of C.R.S. §§ 24-31-309(3.5) and 24-31-903 which are contained in CO SB 217. 2. Note the date the policy was finalized and disseminated.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The APD has developed a policy requiring the collection of specific data required by specific Colorado Revised Statutes as follows: <u>Per C.R.S. §§ 24-31-309(3.5)</u> <i>3) Profiling practices prohibited.</i> Profiling as defined in subsection (2) of this section is prohibited; except that a peace officer may use age when making law enforcement decisions if the peace officer is investigating a juvenile status offense. <i>(3.5) A peace officer, as defined in section 24-31-901 (3), shall have a legal basis for making a contact, as defined in section 24- 31-901 (1), whether consensual or nonconsensual, for making a contact with a member of the public for purposes of enforcing the law or investigating possible violations of the law. After making a contact, a peace officer, as defined in section 24-31-901 (3), shall report to the peace officer's employing agency:</i> <i>(a) The perceived demographic information of the person contacted, provided that the identification of these characteristics is based on the observation and perception of the peace officer making the contact and other available data;</i> <i>(b) Whether the contact was a traffic stop;</i> <i>(c) The time, date, and location of the contact;</i> <i>(d) The duration of the contact;</i> <i>(e) The reason for the contact;</i> <i>(f) The suspected crime; g) The result of the contact, such as:</i>

	<i>(I) No action, warning, citation, property seizure, or arrest;</i> <i>(II) If a warning or citation was issued, the warning provided or violation cited;</i> <i>(III) If an arrest was made, the offense charged;</i> <i>(IV) If the contact was a traffic stop, the information collected, which is limited to the driver;</i> <i>h) The actions taken by the peace officer during the contact, including but not limited to whether:</i> <i>(I) The peace officer asked for consent to search the person, vehicle, or other property, and, if so, whether consent was provided</i> <i>(II) The peace officer searched the person, a vehicle, or any property, and, if so, the basis for the search and the type of contraband or evidence discovered, if any;</i> <i>(III) The peace officer seized any property, and, if so, the type of property that was seized and the basis for seizing the property;</i> <i>(IV) A peace officer unholstered or brandished a weapon during the contact, and, if so, the type of weapon; and</i> <i>(V) A peace officer discharged a weapon during the contact.</i> <u>Per C.R.S. §§ 24-31-903</u> <i>(a) All use of force by its peace officers that results in death or serious bodily injury or that involves the use of a weapon, including:</i> <i>(I) The date, time, and location of the use of force;</i> <i>(II) The perceived demographic information of the person contacted, provided that the identification of these characteristics is based on the observation and perception of the peace officer making the contact and other available data;</i> <i>(III) The names of all peace officers who were at the scene, identified by whether the peace officer was involved in the use of force or not; except that the identity of other peace officers at the scene not directly involved in the use of force shall be identified by the officer's identification number issued by the P.O.S.T. board unless the peace officer is charged criminally or is a defendant to a civil suit as a result arising from the use of force;</i> <i>(IV) The type of force used, the severity and nature of the injury, whether the peace officer suffered physical injury, and the severity of the peace officer's injury;</i> <i>(V) Whether the peace officer was on duty at the time of the use of force;</i> <i>(VI) Whether a peace officer unholstered or brandished a weapon during the incident, and, if so, the type of weapon;</i> <i>(VII) Whether a peace officer discharged a weapon during the incident;</i> <i>(VIII) Whether the use of force resulted in a law enforcement agency investigation and the result of the investigation;</i> <i>(IX) Whether the use of force resulted in a civilian complaint and the resolution of that</i>
--	---

	complaint; (X) Whether an ambulance was called to the scene and whether a person was transported to a hospital from the scene whether in an ambulance or other transportation; and (XI) Whether the person contacted exhibited a weapon during the interaction leading up to the injury or death, and, if so, the type of weapon and whether it was discovered before or after the use of force; (b) All instances when a peace officer resigned while under investigation for violating department policy; (c) All data relating to contacts and entries into a residence, including a forcible entry, conducted by its peace officers, including: (I) The perceived demographic information of the person contacted provided that the identification of these characteristics is based on the observation and perception of the peace officer making the contact and other available data; except that this subsection (2)(c)(I) does not apply to a person contacted who is a witness to a crime or a survivor of a crime; (II) Whether the contact was a traffic stop; (II.5) Whether the contact was a showup, as defined in section 16-1-110 (1)(b); (III) The time, date, and location of the contact; (IV) The duration of the contact; (V) The reason for the contact; (VI) The suspected crime; (VII) The result of the contact, such as: (A) No action, warning, citation, property seizure, or arrest; (B) If a warning or citation was issued, the warning provided or violation cited; (C) If an arrest was made, the offense charged; (D) If the contact was a traffic stop, the information collected, which is limited to the driver; (E) If the contact was a showup, the information collected pursuant to section 16-1-109 (6) for the eyewitness and the subject; (VIII) The actions taken by the peace officer during the contact, including but not limited to whether: (A) The peace officer asked for consent to search the person, and, if so, whether consent was provided; (B) The peace officer searched the person, a vehicle, or any property, and, if so, the basis for the search and the type of contraband or evidence discovered, if any; (C) The peace officer seized any property and, if so, the type of property that was seized and the basis for seizing the property; (D) A peace officer unholstered or brandished a weapon during the contact, and, if so, the type of weapon; and (E) A peace officer discharged a weapon during the contact; (d) All instances of unannounced entry into a residence, with or without a warrant, including: (I) The date, time, and location of the use of unannounced entry; (II) The perceived demographic information of the subject of the unannounced entry, provided that the identification of these characteristics is based on the observation and perception of the peace officer making the entry and other available data; (III) Whether a peace officer unholstered or brandished a weapon during the unannounced entry, and, if so, the type of weapon; and (IV) Whether a peace officer discharged a weapon during the unannounced entry.
--	--

	<i>(e) The number of officer-involved civilian deaths.</i> 3. The policy was disseminated to all appropriate APD personnel. Note that the training content and delivery, implementation and internal review and accountability components of this mandate are assessed under separates mandates within this section.
REQUIRED DATA	Draft of the policy; roster; PowerDMS dissemination records; self-assessment from the APD
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Documentation System of Stops/Contacts- 90 days; Stops Policy Deadline- 120 days; RP 1; RP 2
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandates 34 at V B (1), 35 at V B (2)(a), and 36 at V (2)(b), 37 at V C, 38 at V D; 2 at II A (Page 4); 3 at IIA (Page 4); 33 at V A (Page 17).
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Documentation of Stops – Training Plan Development
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 37 at V C (Page 18)
TEXT	Aurora Police will develop a training plan including, but not limited to, curriculum, material, and, if needed, scenario-based modules, in consultation with the Consent Decree Monitor and, as needed, outside experts, for implementing the new policies and for any revisions of current policies required by the Stops Training Plan Deadline.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if APD developed a Training Plan that sufficiently covers stops/contacts policies.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review proposed Training Plan covering stops/contacts including all materials provided (curricula, syllabi, scenarios) and determine its sufficiency in covering stops/contacts policies. 2. Note the date the Training Plan was completed.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The APD has developed a Training Plan that sufficiently covers the stops/contacts policies; and 2. The Training Plan was completed. Note that training delivery is assessed separately under mandate 38 V. D. 2
REQUIRED DATA	All associated training materials; self-assessment from the APD
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Documentation System for Stops/Contacts - 90 days; Stops Policy Deadline- 120 days; Stops Policy Training Deadline – 180 days; Stops Policy Training Completion – 365 days; RP 1; RP 2; RP 3; RP 4
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 4 at IIB (Page 5); Mandate 34 at V B (1) (Page 17); Mandate 35 at V B (2)(a) (Page 18); Mandate 36 at V (2)(b) (Page 18), Mandate 37 at V C, mandate 38 at V D,
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Documentation of Stops - Training – Training (Delivery)
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 38 at V C (Page 18)
TEXT	The Consent Decree Monitor may review training after it begins. Aurora Police will train substantially all the police personnel who interact with the public by the Stops Training Completion Deadline.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if the training delivered is consistent with the training syllabi as described in the training plan and that all appropriate APD personnel have completed the training.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Observe and evaluate associated training(s) to ensure it is consistent with the training syllabi submitted. 2. Review attendance records compared to most recent department roster and determine if all appropriate personnel have completed the training.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The APD delivered the stops/contacts training consistent with the training syllabi and plans as submitted in Mandate 37 Section V C; and, 2. All appropriate APD personnel have completed the training.
REQUIRED DATA	Training attendance records, observations of the training; roster; self-assessment from the APD
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Stops Training Completion – 365 days; RP 5, 7, 9, and 11
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 37 at V C (Page 18)
MONITOR FORM(S)	Training Evaluation Form

TITLE	Documentation of Stops - Goals and Measurements
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 39 at V D (Page 19)
TEXT	Compliance with this section will be measured by 1) creating appropriate policies in the time required, 2) effectively training personnel in the time required, and 3) monitoring compliance with the policies based on performance in the field. Monitoring will include, at least, review of samples of body-worn camera footage, ride-alongs, and review of reports required by law, as appropriate.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if the APD developed, finalized, and disseminated the policies required in this section and note the date of dissemination. Determine if all appropriate APD personnel completed training according to the Training Plan and note the date the training was completed. Determine if the APD is effectively monitoring its compliance with the policies based on performance in the field.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Use the Monitor's compliance determination for policy finalization and dissemination in Mandates 34-36, Section V B 1-2 a and b. 3. Use the Monitor's compliance determination for training development in Mandate 37, Section V C. 4. Use the Monitor's compliance determination for training delivery in Mandate 38, Section V C. 5. Review body-worn camera footage to determine if officers are adhering to the stops/contacts policies are being followed. 6. Conduct ride-alongs to determine if officers are knowledgeable of the APD's stops/contacts policies. 7. Review other reports such as arrests, use of force investigations, complaints to determine if officers are adhering to the stops/contacts policies. 8. Review APD's internal review process to assess APD's internal compliance monitoring. 9. Ensure appropriate accountability measures are in place for failure to comply with the stops/contacts policy and training requirements.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. Compliance is achieved with Mandate 34-36 Section V A and B 1-2; 2. Compliance is achieved with Mandate 37 Section V C; 3. The APD has implemented an internal review process to monitor its compliance with related policies;

	4. The Monitor's implementation testing as described in the Monitor's Methodologies above, concludes that the related policies have been fully implemented; and, 5. Appropriate accountability measures are utilized in instances of individual failure to comply with the policies and/or training.
REQUIRED DATA	Policies and training plan, BWC footage, PowerDMS dissemination records, training attendance records, roster, ride-alongs, use of force reports, complaints, arrests, stops/contacts data, self-assessment from the APD
SAMPLE REQUIRED	TBD
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Documentation System for Stops/Contacts - 90 days; Stops Policy Deadline- 120 days; Stops Policy Training Deadline – 180 days; Stops Policy Training Completion – 365 days; RP 1; RP 2; RP 3; RP 4; every other RPs thereafter
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 4 at IIB (Page 5); Mandate 34 at V B (1) (Page 17); Mandate 35 at V B (2)(a) (Page 18); Mandate 36 at V (2)(b) (Page 18); Mandate 38 at V D (Page 19)
MONITOR FORM(S)	

SECTION VI – CHEMICAL RESTRAINTS

TITLE	Use of Ketamine and Other Sedatives as a Chemical Restraint – Objectives
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 40 at VI A (Page 20)
TEXT	If the City seeks to use ketamine in the field during the time that any part of this Consent Decree remains in effect, the Consent Decree Monitor will first review the medical protocol for the use of ketamine. Aurora Fire Rescue may not use ketamine in the field during the effective period of this Consent Decree without the agreement of the Consent Decree Monitor that its use complies with applicable law in consultation with the Aurora Fire Rescue Medical Director. Any objections that cannot be resolved will be resolved using the agreed dispute resolution procedure outlined below in Section XI.
TASK DESCRIPTION	The Monitor will verify that ketamine is not being use in the field during the time Consent Decree is in effect without explicit agreement of the Consent Decree Monitor that its use complies with applicable law in consultation with the Aurora Fire Rescue Medical Director.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review AFR's use of chemical sedatives to determine if ketamine is being used. 2. If used, ensure prior notification and approval was obtained.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will only be assessed if the City seeks to re-implement the use of Ketamine in the field. If so compliance will be achieved when: 1. The AFR promptly notifies such desire to the Monitor and, 2. Ketamine is not used in the field unless and until such use is approved by the the Monitor after appropriate consultation with the AFR Medical Director
REQUIRED DATA	self-assessment from AFR, including attestation of non-use of ketamine
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	RP 1 and every other RP thereafter
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Use of Ketamine and Other Sedatives as a Chemical Restraint – Objectives
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 41 VI A (Page 20)
TEXT	The Parties share the goal of ensuring that the use of any chemical sedatives as chemical restraints in the field is done in accordance with applicable law and other requirements. The Report did not investigate the use of other chemical sedatives as chemical restraints in the field by Aurora Fire Rescue because ketamine was one of the two administered chemical sedatives used during the period of review by the Attorney General's office and it received substantial public scrutiny. Therefore, for other chemical sedatives used as a chemical restraint, Aurora Fire will (1) ensure that policies and procedures reflect strict compliance with state law and any waiver requirements, and (2) closely review use of these sedatives to confirm policy compliance. This agreement is not intended to interfere with the Medical Director's determination of the need for and requirements for waivers for other controlled substances. The Consent Decree Monitor will periodically review Aurora Fire Rescue's use of chemical sedatives as chemical restraints to confirm policy compliance.
TASK DESCRIPTION	The Monitor will determine if AFR's policies and procedures reflect strict compliance with state law and any waiver requirements and closely review use of these sedatives to confirm policy compliance.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review and evaluate the AFR's policies and procedures regarding use of chemical sedatives. 2. Review use of chemical sedatives to determine if all such uses are in compliance with its policies and procedures.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The AFR policies and procedures are in compliance with state law and waiver requirements; and, 2. Any chemical restraints used in the field were performed in adherence to AFR's policies and procedures.
REQUIRED DATA	Policies and procedures regarding use of chemical sedatives; forms documenting any use of chemical sedation (Monthly Sedation Report); relevant BWC footage from APD; self-assessment from AFR
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	RP 1 and every other RP ever RP 1

CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Use of Ketamine and Other Sedatives as Chemical Restraint – Objectives
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 42 VI A (Page 21)
TEXT	The Consent Decree Monitor will review and analyze the coordination of policies of Aurora Police and Aurora Fire Rescue to ensure that members of Aurora Police do not recommend, suggest, or otherwise encourage the use of any chemical restraint in the field by Aurora Fire Rescue. The use of any chemical restraint in the field will be a decision made only by qualified members of Aurora Fire Rescue and the applicable medical protocols in effect and approved by Aurora Fire's medical director in compliance with C.R.S. § 26-20-104 et seq.
TASK DESCRIPTION	The Monitor will determine if coordination of policies of AFR and APD do not recommend, suggest, or otherwise encourage the use of any chemical restraint in the field by AFR. The Monitor will confirm that any decision to use chemical restraints in the field was made by qualified members of AFR only in accordance with the applicable medical protocols in effect and approved by AFR's medical director in compliance with C.R.S. § 26-20-104 et seq.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review and evaluate the AFR and APD policies and any relevant Body Worn Camera (BWC) footage to ensure that there is no written or actual recommendation, suggestion, or other encouragement by the police officers, for AFR to use of any chemical restraint in the field. 2. Review incidents of the use of any chemical restraint in the field to ensure that any use will be a decision made only by qualified members of AFR and the applicable medical protocols in effect and approved by AFR's medical director in compliance with C.R.S. § 26-20-104 et seq.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The AFR's and APD's policies associated with chemical restraints prohibit police officers from recommending, suggesting, or otherwise encouraging the use of and chemical restraint by AFR in the field. 2. The AFR's policies state that chemical sedatives are only used in the field by qualified AFR members in accordance with applicable medical protocols as approved by AFR's medical director in compliance with the applicable statute. 3. The AFR and APD joint training required by Mandate 31 Section IV D 3. adequately covers this topic. 4. The APD members or policies do not encourage the use of chemical restraints by AFR in the field.

	5. Chemical restraints have only been administered by qualified AFR personnel pursuant to the applicable policies.
REQUIRED DATA	Policies and procedures governing joint efforts of AFR and APD; policies governing use of chemical sedative; training based on the policies; review of any use of chemical sedatives; BWC from selected APD/AFR runs; self-assessment from AFR
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	RP 1 and every other RP thereafter
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 39 at VI A (Page 20); Mandate 40 VI A (Page 20)
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Use of Ketamine and Other Sedatives as a Chemical Restraint – Objectives
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 43 at VI A (Page 21)
TEXT	The Consent Decree Monitor will meet and confer with each Department to resolve any objections raised by the Consent Decree Monitor. Any objections that cannot be resolved will be resolved using the agreed dispute resolution procedure outlined below in Section XI.
TASK DESCRIPTION	The Monitor will determine if the APD and AFR meet to resolve any objections raised by the Consent Decree Monitor.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review discussions with AFR and APD to resolve objections raised by the Consent Decree Monitor. Determine if any were unresolved and if so, verify if APD and AFR met with the Monitor.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when the AFR and APD have met and conferred with the the Monitor in order to determine if there are issues that need to be resolved relative to the provisions of this consent decree requirement, and have attempted in good faith to resolve those issues.
REQUIRED DATA	Meetings with APD and AFR; self-assessment from APD and AFR
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	RP 1 and every RP thereafter
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 39 at VI A (Page 20); Mandate 40 VI A (Page 20) ; Mandate 41 VI A (Page 21)
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Use of Ketamine and Other Sedatives as a Chemical Restraint – Policy Changes if Ketamine is Used
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 44 at VI C (Page 21)
TEXT	The City and Aurora Fire Rescue have stated they do not intend to use ketamine again in the field, but if Aurora Fire Rescue does seek to reinstate ketamine usage in the field, Aurora Fire Rescue will work with the Consent Decree Monitor under Section II.A. The Consent Decree Monitor will work with the Medical Director to specifically focus on policy and procedure to ensure the policy dictates appropriate dosage recommendations and a procedure for how members of Aurora Fire Rescue will assess the level of patient agitation that would lead to the use of ketamine in the field.
TASK DESCRIPTION	The Monitor will confirm that ketamine is not being used in the field. If AFR wants to reinstate ketamine use, the Monitor will ensure that the policy dictates appropriate dosage recommendations and a procedure for how members of AFR will assess the level of patient agitation that would lead to the use of ketamine in the field.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review documentation of any use of chemical sedatives in the field to confirm that ketamine is not being used. 2. Review policy and procedures only if AFR wants to reinstate ketamine in the field.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will only be assessed if AFR seeks to resume the use of Ketamine in the field as a chemical restraint. To the extent that AFR wishes to resume the use of Ketamine as a chemical restraint, compliance will be achieved when the Monitor has been notified and discussions for the resumption of its use have duly considered dosage recommendations and assessment of the level of patient agitation.
REQUIRED DATA	Documentation of any use of ketamine in the field, relevant BWC footage from APD, policy and procedures if ketamine is to be reinstated; self-assessment from the AFR
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	RP 1 and every other RP thereafter and any RP where AFR expresses the desire to reinstate ketamine in the field

CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 39 at VI A (Page 20)
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Use of Ketamine and Other Sedatives as a Chemical Restraint - Process Changes
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 45 at VI D (Page 23)
TEXT	Aurora Fire Rescue will develop a procedure for post-incident analysis that the Consent Decree Monitor must agree with, using the procedures in Section II.A, before Aurora Fire Rescue may use ketamine in the field.
TASK DESCRIPTION	The Monitor will determine if AFR developed a procedure for post-incident analysis before using ketamine in the field.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. If AFR seeks to use ketamine in the field, review draft of procedure for post-incident analysis for potential use of ketamine in the field. 2. Verify that the Consent Decree Monitor has agreed with such analysis using the procedure in Section II.A.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will only be assessed if AFR seeks to resume the use of Ketamine as a chemical restraint. If so, compliance will be achieved when: 1. The AFR developed a post-incident analysis and it is approved by the Monitor; and 3. The AFR completes such post-incident analysis in an appropriate manner for each application of Ketamine used as a chemical restraint.
REQUIRED DATA	Draft of the procedure for post-incident analysis; self-assessment from AFR
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	TBD
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 2 at II A (Page 4)
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Use of Ketamine and Other Sedatives as a Chemical Restraint – Evaluation of Chemical Sedation
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 46 at VI D (2) (Page 23)
TEXT	In addition to the current process of reviewing each incident where Aurora Fire Rescue uses chemical sedation as a chemical restraint in the field, Aurora Fire Rescue shall develop a process to periodically review its use of chemical sedation in the field to determine what improvements should be made to policy or training at Aurora Fire Rescue or Aurora Police, including assessing 1) whether the symptoms justified sedation under law and policy, 2) the involvement of police officers before or during a patient's sedation, and 3) what factors increase the risk of adverse outcomes to patients or providers.
TASK DESCRIPTION	The Monitor will determine if the AFR developed a process to periodically review its use of chemical sedation in the field to determine what improvements should be made to policy or training at AFR or APD, including assessing 1) whether the symptoms justified sedation under law and policy, 2) the involvement of police officers before or during a patient's sedation, and 3) what factors increase the risk of adverse outcomes to patients or providers.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review and evaluate AFR's written process to periodically review its use of chemical sedation in the field to determine what improvements should be made to policy or training at AFR or APD. 2. Confirm that such review includes at a minimum, assessing 1) whether the symptoms justified sedation under law and policy, 2) the involvement of police officers before or during a patient's sedation, and 3) what factors increase the risk of adverse outcomes to patients or providers.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The AFR has developed a written process to periodically review its use of chemical sedation in the field for the purpose of policy or training improvement for both AFR and APD and; 2. At a minimum, the process shall be semi-annual and include a determination for each use to assess the following: 1) whether the symptoms justified sedation under law and policy; 2) the degree of involvement of police officers before or during a patient's sedation and 3) what factors increase the risk of adverse outcomes to patients or providers; Note that implementation of this mandate is assessed in Mandate 48 at VI E.

REQUIRED DATA	Documentation of use of chemical sedation in the field; relevant BWC footage from APD; procedure for periodic review; self-assessment from AFR, including description of biannual review of prior 6 months of data, looking at usage rates, compliance with documentation and protocols including analysis of trends or recurring problems and any determination if any changes to protocols or trainings are needed.
SAMPLE REQUIRED	
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	RP 1 and every RP thereafter
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Evaluation of Chemical sedation
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 47 at VI D (2) (Page 23)
TEXT	Aurora Fire Rescue shall summarize this periodic review to the Consent Decree Monitor at least twice a year, starting 6 months from the effective date. This summary will include at least information about the number of times Aurora Fire Rescue used chemical sedation as a chemical restraint, the symptoms justifying sedation, the type of chemical restraint used, whether Aurora Fire Rescue followed policy, what information police officers provided to Aurora Fire Rescue for compliance with C.R.S. § 18-8-805, and basic information about the use such as the tabular data included on pages 97-98 of the Report. Nothing in this section should be construed to discourage Aurora Police from providing Aurora Fire Rescue with necessary information about an incident, as this information will only be used to comply with C.R.S. § 18-8-805(2)(b).¹ This requirement does not require the public disclosure of any confidential information.
TASK DESCRIPTION	The Monitor will determine if the AFR summarized its periodic reviews to the Consent Decree Monitor at least twice a year, starting 6 months from the effective date. Confirm that the summary includes at a minimum, information about the number of times Aurora Fire Rescue used chemical sedation as a chemical restraint, the symptoms justifying sedation, the type of chemical restraint used, whether Aurora Fire Rescue followed policy, what information police officers provided to Aurora Fire Rescue for compliance with C.R.S. § 18-8-805, and basic information about the use such as the tabular data included on pages 97-98 of the AG's Report.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review and evaluate the summary of the periodic review from AFR, at least twice a year.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when the AFR's periodic review is conducted at semi-annually and includes at a minimum, the number of times AFR used chemical sedation as a chemical restraint, the symptoms justifying the sedation, the type of chemical restraint used, whether policy was followed, and what information was provided by APD personnel for compliance with CSR 18-8-805.
REQUIRED DATA	Summary of the periodic review; self-assessment from AFR
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A

TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	RP 2; RP 4- 12
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Use of Ketamine and Other Sedatives as a Chemical Restraint – Goals and Measurement
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 48 at VI E (Page 24)
TEXT	If the City implements the use of ketamine in the field again using the process set forth above, the Monitor will review any use regularly and include such review in the Court reports addressing at least the issues identified in the Report on the reporting timetables set forth in Section IX.A.5.
TASK DESCRIPTION	The Monitor will review any use of ketamine regularly, and include such review in the Court reports addressing at least the issues identified in the AG's Report, if the City implements the use of ketamine in the field again after completing the Monitor-approved process. In reporting such information, the Monitor will include its assessment of the proper use of ketamine, if any, as described in the Compliance Definition below.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review any use of ketamine regularly, if reinstated.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be assessed only if the AFR seeks to resume the use of Ketamine in the field. If so, compliance will be achieved when: 1. The AFR has only used it as a chemical restraint when symptoms appropriately justify the sedation; 2. The AFR has not been influenced in its decision to use Ketamine by APD; and, 3. The AFR has administered the appropriate dosage of Ketamine.
REQUIRED DATA	Documentation of use of ketamine; relevant BWC footage from APD; self-assessment from AFR
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	TBD
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 2 at II A (Page 4); Mandate 43 at VI C (Page 21); Mandate 44 at VI D (Page 23)
MONITOR FORM(S)	

SECTION VII – RECRUITMENT, HIRING and PROMOTION

TITLE	Recruitment, Hiring, and Promotion – Objectives
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 49 at VII A (Page 25)
TEXT	The City will transform recruiting and hiring processes to create a more diverse and qualified workforce and establish Aurora Police and Aurora Fire Rescue's commitments to a culture of continuous improvement and becoming better police and fire departments.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if the City has transformed recruiting and hiring processes to create a more diverse and qualified workforce and establish APD and AFR's commitments to a culture of continuous improvement and becoming better police and fire departments.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Confirm that the City has obtained technical assistance from an appropriate Subject Matter Expert (SME) as required in Mandate 64, Section VII C.4, to identify metrics and measurement to assess the level of improvement. 2. Review and evaluate APD and AFR's recruitment, hiring, communication, and promotion policies, processes and procedures, recruitment plan, and hiring and promotion statistical data and specific State, City and/or Department guidance on diversity and inclusion in accordance with the SME's recommendations to confirm implementation. Such evaluation should include a review of discipline decisions made in Mandate 63 at VII 3 (b) and any disparate impact on race, gender, and ethnicity. 3. Determine if the City has implemented the policies and plans described in Mandates 50-64 and 66 Section VII A-C 1-3 a-b, and 5 to improve its recruiting and hiring processes to create a more diverse, inclusive, and qualified workforce. 4. Determine if the APD and AFR have demonstrated commitments to a culture of sustainable and continuous improvement, by implementing the above policies and plans thereby making APD and AFR better departments.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The City has achieved compliance with Mandates 50-64 and 66 Section VII A-C 1-5; 2. The City has implemented the policies and plans described in Mandates 50-64 and 66 Section VII A-C 1-3 a-b, and 5 to create a more diverse, inclusive, and qualified workforce in APD; 3. The City has implemented the policies and plans described in Mandates 50-64 and 66 Section VII A-C 1-3 a-b, and 5 to the created a more diverse, inclusive, and qualified workforce in AFR;

	4. The APD has implemented the policies and plans described in Mandates 50-64 and 66 Section VII A-C 1-3 a-b, and 5 demonstrating its commitment to a culture of sustainable and continuous Improvement; and 5. The AFR has implemented the policies and plans described in Mandates 50-64 and 66 Section VII A-C 1-3 a-b, and 5 demonstrating its commitment to a culture of sustainable and continuous improvement.
REQUIRED DATA	Recruitment, hiring, communication, and promotion data from APD, AFR, and CSC; policies, processes and procedures regarding recruitment, hiring, and promoting; self-assessment from the City (or APD, AFR and CSC); Demographics data reviewed for recruitment, hiring and promotion; All data used by 21CP in support of their report of findings; any data or information used in support of any and all reviews and reports conducted on recruitment, hiring and promotion within APD and AFD; oral interviews/exams and written testing results; Statistical data of pass/fail rates on oral and written exams, and polygraph examination pass/fail results by race, gender and ethnicity. Pass/Fail and other data retained by Assessment Centers for fitness tests, polygraph, substance abuse screening, job suitability assessment, medical exam results, and background investigations;
SAMPLE REQUIRED	TBD
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Civil Service Commission Outside Expert Retention Deadline – 90 days; Recruitment Plan Deadline – 455 days; Civil Service Commission Rules and Regulations Modification Deadline – 455 days; RP 1 (baseline); RP 5; and every other RP thereafter
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 49 at VII A (Page 25); Mandates 50-64 and 66
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Recruitment, Hiring, and Promotion – Objectives
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 50 at VII A (Page 25)
TEXT	The City will also improve transparency, accountability and predictability in discipline review, including by facilitating the Civil Service Commission's standardization and codification of elements of its disciplinary review process.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if the City improves transparency, accountability and predictability in discipline review, including by facilitating the Civil Service Commission's standardization and codification of elements of its disciplinary review process.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review and evaluate the City's plan to improve transparency, accountability, and predictability in its discipline review. 2. Review and evaluate the CSC's standardized and codified disciplinary review process. 3. Review and evaluate subsequent implementation of the City and CSC's efforts to improve transparency, accountability, and predictability of discipline review.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The City has improved transparency, accountability, and predictability of the CSC's review of discipline; and, 2. The CSC has a standardized and codified disciplinary review process.
REQUIRED DATA	TBD, self-assessment from the City and/or CSC
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	RP 2 (baseline) and every other RP thereafter
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 49 at VII A (Page 25)
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Recruitment, Hiring, and Promotion – Objectives
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 51 at VII A (Page 25)
TEXT	The City will also improve transparency and accountability about all of the Civil Service Commission's work, such that community members understand the role that the Commission plays in hiring, promotion, and discipline, as well as any changes the Commission makes to those processes.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if the City improves transparency and accountability about all of the CSC's work, such that community members understand the role that the Commission plays in hiring, promotion, and discipline, as well as any changes the Commission makes to those processes.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	4. Review and evaluate the City's plan to improve transparency and accountability about all of the Civil Service Commission's (CSC) work. 5. Review and evaluate the CSC's plans for ensuring community members understand the role that the CSC plays in hiring, promotion and discipline. 6. Review and evaluate subsequent implementation of City's and CSC's efforts to improve transparency and accountability related to the CSC's work.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 3. The City has improved transparency in the CSC's work such that community members understand the role that the CSC plays in hiring, promotion and discipline; 4. The City has improved accountability of the CSC's work, such that community members understand the role that accountability plays in hiring, promotion and discipline; and 5. The City has programs, processes, and procedures for ensuring transparency and sustaining community engagement and relations related to CSC's work.
REQUIRED DATA	TBD self-assessment from the City and/or CSC
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	RP 2 (baseline) and every other RP thereafter
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 49 at VII A (Page 25); Mandate 50 at VII A (Page 25)
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Recruitment, Hiring, and Promotion – Recruitment (APD)
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 52 at VII B (Page 26)
TEXT	To maintain high-quality service, ensure employee safety and accountability, and promote constitutional, effective policing, Aurora Police and Aurora Fire Rescue will review and revise as necessary recruitment and hiring programs to ensure that Aurora Police and Aurora Fire Rescue successfully attract and hire a diverse group of qualified individuals for their civil service positions. Aurora Police and Aurora Fire Rescue will develop written recruitment plans that include, but are not limited to, these items: clear goals, objectives, and action steps for attracting and retaining a quality work force that better reflects the diversity of the City.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if the APD developed written recruitment plans that include, but are not limited to, these items: clear goals, objectives, and action steps for attracting and retaining a quality work force that better reflects the diversity of the City.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review and evaluate written recruitment plans from APD.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The APD has reviewed, revised and documented its recruitment and hiring plans into a comprehensive program that is designed with the goal of successfully attracting and hiring a diverse group of qualified individuals for civil service positions; and 2. The APD plan contains clear goals, objectives, and actionable steps for attracting and retaining a workforce that better reflects the diversity of the City. Note that implementation component of this mandate is assessed in Mandate 49 Section VII A.
REQUIRED DATA	Written recruitment plan from APD; self-assessment from the APD; details of any recruitment referral incentive programs; recruitment advertisement; methodologies used for identifying targeted recruitment needs.
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Civil Service Commission Outside Expert Retention Deadline – 90 days; Recruitment Plan Deadline – 455 days; Civil Service Commission Rules and Regulations Modification Deadline – 455 days; RP 1 (baseline); RP 5; and every other RP thereafter

CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 49 at VII A (Page 25); Mandate 50 at VII A (Page 25)
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Recruitment, Hiring, and Promotion – Recruitment (AFR)
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 53 at VII B (Page 26)
TEXT	To maintain high-quality service, ensure employee safety and accountability, and promote constitutional, effective policing, Aurora Police and Aurora Fire Rescue will review and revise as necessary recruitment and hiring programs to ensure that Aurora Police and Aurora Fire Rescue successfully attract and hire a diverse group of qualified individuals for their civil service positions. Aurora Police and Aurora Fire Rescue will develop written recruitment plans that include, but are not limited to, these items: clear goals, objectives, and action steps for attracting and retaining a quality work force that better reflects the diversity of the City.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine that the AFR developed written recruitment plans that include, but are not limited to, these items: clear goals, objectives, and action steps for attracting and retaining a quality work force that better reflects the diversity of the City.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review and evaluate written recruitment plans from AFR.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The AFR has reviewed, revised and documented its recruitment and hiring plans into a comprehensive program that is designed with the goal of successfully attracting and hiring a diverse group of qualified individuals for civil service positions; and, 2. The AFR plan contains clear goals, objectives, and actionable steps for attracting and retaining a workforce that better reflects the diversity of the City. Note that implementation component of this mandate is assessed in Mandate 49 Section VII A.
REQUIRED DATA	Written recruitment plan from AFR; self-assessment from the AFR; details of any recruitment referral incentive programs; recruitment advertisement; methodologies used for identifying targeted recruitment needs
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Civil Service Commission Outside Expert Retention Deadline – 90 days; Recruitment Plan Deadline – 455 days; Civil Service Commission Rules and Regulations Modification Deadline – 455 days; RP 1 (baseline); RP 5; and every other RP thereafter

CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 49 at VII A (Page 25); Mandate 50 at VII A (Page 25)
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Recruitment, Hiring, and Promotion – Recruitment (APD)
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 54 at VII B (1) (Page 26)
TEXT	The recruitment plans should include, at a minimum, the following: (1). A schedule to work with the Civil Service Commission to review and make any applicable changes to the minimum qualifications for entry- level police and fire recruits and lateral hires;
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if the APD’s recruitment plan includes a schedule to work with the CSC to review and make any applicable changes to the hiring qualifications.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review the APD’s written recruitment plan. 2. Confirm the presence of a schedule to work with the CSC. 3. Confirm the plan incorporates at a minimum, a process for conducting ongoing assessment of community demographic, discretionary decision points, and identifying potential bias.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when the APD’s written recruitment plan as revised collaboratively with the CSC, at a minimum incorporates a process for conducting ongoing assessment of community demographic, discretionary decision points, and identifying potential bias. Note that implementation component of this mandate is assessed in Mandate 49 Section VII A.
REQUIRED DATA	Written recruitment plan from APD; self-assessment from the APD
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Civil Service Commission Outside Expert Retention Deadline – 90 days; Recruitment Plan Deadline – 455 days; Civil Service Commission Rules and Regulations Modification Deadline – 455 days; RP 1 (baseline); RP 5; and every other RP thereafter
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 49 at VII A (Page 25) ; Mandate 50 at VII A (Page 25); Mandate 52 at VII B (Page 26)
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Recruitment, Hiring, and Promotion – Recruitment (AFR)
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 55 at VII B (1) (Page 26)
TEXT	The recruitment plans should include, at a minimum, the following: (1). A schedule to work with the Civil Service Commission to review and make any applicable changes to the minimum qualifications for entry- level police and fire recruits and lateral hires;
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if the AFR's recruitment plan includes a schedule to work with the CSC to review and make any applicable changes to the hiring qualifications.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review the AFR's written recruitment plan 2. Confirm the presence of a schedule to work with the CSC. 3. Confirm the plan incorporates at a minimum, a process for conducting ongoing assessment of community demographic, discretionary decision points, and identifying potential bias.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when the AFR's written recruitment plan as revised collaboratively with the CSC at a minimum, incorporates a process for conducting ongoing assessment of community demographic, discretionary decision points, and identifying potential bias. Note that implementation component of this mandate is assessed in Mandate 49 Section VII A.
REQUIRED DATA	Written recruitment plan from AFR; self-assessment from the AFRy
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Civil Service Commission Outside Expert Retention Deadline – 90 days; Recruitment Plan Deadline – 455 days; Civil Service Commission Rules and Regulations Modification Deadline – 455 days; RP 1 (baseline); RP 5; and every other RP thereafter
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 49 at VII A (Page 25); Mandate 50 at VII A (Page 25); Mandate 52 at VII B (Page 26)
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Recruitment (Outreach for Diversity) (APD)
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 56 at VII B (2) (Page 26)
TEXT	The recruitment plans should include, at a minimum, the following: (2). A plan to conduct outreach to many community leaders and stakeholders, aimed at increasing the diversity of each Department's applicant pool—including race, color, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, national origin, and religion—and identifying recruit and lateral applicants that are committed to community-oriented policing (for police officers) and have the identified skills to succeed in the applicable role;
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if the APD's written recruitment plan includes a plan to conduct outreach to many community leaders and stakeholders, aimed at increasing the diversity of each Department's applicant pool—including race, color, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, national origin, and religion—and identifying recruit and lateral applicants that are committed to community-oriented policing (for police officers) and have the identified skills to succeed in the applicable role.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review and evaluate the APD's recruitment plan's outreach plan.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieve when: 1. The APD has developed a plan to conduct outreach to community leaders and stakeholders aimed at increasing diversity in the pool of candidates for both recruits and lateral hires; 2. The APD plan has identified recruit and lateral applicants that are committed to community oriented policing and have identified the skills necessary to succeed in the role of police officer; and 3. The APD plan has processes to ensure sustainability of the plan itself. Note that implementation component of this mandate is assessed in Mandate 49 Section VII A.
REQUIRED DATA	Written recruitment plan from APD; self-assessment from the APD
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Civil Service Commission Outside Expert Retention Deadline – 90 days; Recruitment Plan Deadline – 455 days; Civil Service Commission Rules and

	Regulations Modification Deadline – 455 days; RP 1 (baseline); RP 5; and every other RP thereafter
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 49 at VII A (Page 25); Mandate 50 at VII A (Page 25); Mandate 52 at VII B (Page 26); Mandate 54 at VII B (1) (Page 26)
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Recruitment (Outreach for Diversity) (AFR)
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 57 at VII B (2) (Page 26)
TEXT	The recruitment plans should include, at a minimum, the following: (2). A plan to conduct outreach to many community leaders and stakeholders, aimed at increasing the diversity of each Department's applicant pool—including race, color, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, national origin, and religion—and identifying recruit and lateral applicants that are committed to community-oriented policing (for police officers) and have the identified skills to succeed in the applicable role;
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if the AFR's written recruitment plan includes a plan to conduct outreach to many community leaders and stakeholders, aimed at increasing the diversity of each Department's applicant pool—including race, color, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, national origin, and religion—and identifying recruit and lateral applicants that are committed to community-oriented policing (for police officers) and have the identified skills to succeed in the applicable role.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review and evaluate the AFR's recruitment plan's outreach plan.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The AFR has developed a plan to conduct outreach to community leaders and stakeholders aimed at increasing diversity in the pool of candidates for both recruits and lateral hires; 2. The AFR plan has identified recruit and lateral applicants that meet the hiring qualification as determined with the outside expert and have identified the skills necessary to succeed in the role of paramedic; and 3. The AFR plan has processes to ensure sustainability of the plan itself. Note that implementation component of this mandate is assessed in Mandate 49 Section VII A.
REQUIRED DATA	Written recruitment plan from AFR; self-assessment from the AFR
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Civil Service Commission Outside Expert Retention Deadline – 90 days; Recruitment Plan Deadline – 455 days; Civil Service Commission Rules and Regulations Modification Deadline – 455 days; RP 1 (baseline); RP 5; and every other RP thereafter

CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 49 at VII A (Page 25); Mandate 50 at VII A (Page 25); Mandate 52 at VII B (Page 26); Mandate 55 at VII B (1) (a) (Page 26)
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Recruitment, Hiring, and Promotion – Recruitment (APD)
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 58 at VII B (3) (Page 26)
TEXT	The recruitment plans should include, at a minimum, the following: (3). A plan to broadly distribute information about career opportunities, compensation, hiring, the applicable testing process(es), and deadlines and other requirements of each position throughout the Denver metro- area regularly. The same information will be easily available on the City’s website, with the ability for interested persons to directly contact a member of the recruiting team of each Department.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if the APD’s written recruitment plan includes a plan to broadly distribute information about career opportunities, compensation, hiring, the applicable testing process(es), and deadlines and other requirements of each position throughout the Denver metro- area regularly. Determine if the same information is easily available on the City’s website, and includes the ability for interested persons to directly contact a member of the recruiting team of each Department.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review the APD’s written recruitment plan’s plan and confirm it includes broad distribution information about career opportunities, compensation, hiring, the applicable testing processes, and deadlines and other requirements of each position through the Denver metro-area regularly. 2. Confirm that the information is easily available on the City’s website, and includes the ability for interested persons to directly contact a member of the recruiting team of each Department.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when the APD has developed a plan to broadly distribute information about career opportunities throughout the Denver metro area as well as posting same on the agency's website in an easily accessible manner along with direct contact information for the recruiting team. Note that implementation component of this mandate is assessed in Mandate 49 Section VII A.
REQUIRED DATA	Written recruitment plan from APD; self-assessment from the APD
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Civil Service Commission Outside Expert Retention Deadline – 90 days; Recruitment Plan Deadline – 455 days; Civil Service Commission Rules and

	Regulations Modification Deadline – 455 days; RP 1 (baseline); RP 5; and every other RP thereafter
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 49 at VII A (Page 25); Mandate 50 at VII A (Page 25); Mandate 52 at VII B (Page 26); Mandate 54 at VII B (1) (a) (Page 26); Mandate 56 at VII B (2) (Page 26)
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Recruitment, Hiring, and Promotion – Recruitment (AFR)
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 59 at VII B (3) (Page 26)
TEXT	The recruitment plans should include, at a minimum, the following: (3). A plan to broadly distribute information about career opportunities, compensation, hiring, the applicable testing process(es), and deadlines and other requirements of each position throughout the Denver metro- area regularly. The same information will be easily available on the City’s website, with the ability for interested persons to directly contact a member of the recruiting team of each Department.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if the AFR’s written recruitment plan includes a plan to broadly distribute information about career opportunities, compensation, hiring, the applicable testing process(es), and deadlines and other requirements of each position throughout the Denver metro- area regularly. Determine if the same information is easily available on the City’s website, and includes the ability for interested persons to directly contact a member of the recruiting team of each Department
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review the AFR’s written recruitment plan’s and confirm it includes broad distribution information about career opportunities, compensation, hiring, the applicable testing processes, and deadlines and other requirements of each position through the Denver metro-area regularly. 2. Confirm that the information is easily available on the City’s website, and includes the ability for interested persons to directly contact a member of the recruiting team of each Department.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when the AFR has developed a plan to broadly distribute information about career opportunities throughout the Denver metro area as well as posting same on the agency’s website in an easily accessible manner along with direct contact information for the recruiting team. Note that implementation component of this mandate is assessed in Mandate 49 Section VII A.
REQUIRED DATA	Written recruitment plan from AFR; self-assessment from the AFR
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Civil Service Commission Outside Expert Retention Deadline – 90 days; Recruitment Plan Deadline – 455 days; Civil Service Commission Rules and

	Regulations Modification Deadline – 455 days; RP 1 (baseline); RP 5; and every other RP thereafter
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 49 at VII A (Page 25); Mandate 50 at VII A (Page 25); Mandate 52 at VII B (Page 26); Mandate 55 at VII B (1) (a) (Page 26); Mandate 57 at VII B (2) (Page 26)
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Recruitment, Hiring, and Promotion - Civil Service Commission (Hiring of Entry-Level Police Officers and Firefighters)
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 60 at VII C (Page 27)
TEXT	Before the effective date of this Consent Decree, the Civil Service Commission handled the entire process of hiring entry-level police officers and firefighters. This process led to new civil service employees and the departments meeting each other for the first time after the new employee is appointed and assigned to the training academy. To implement this Consent Decree and the policies and goals it requires, this process will be reworked so that Aurora Police and Aurora Fire Rescue, with coordination and assistance from the Aurora Human Resources Department, will assume a much more active role in the hiring of candidates from the eligibility lists prepared by the Commission and have the final say on which candidates are hired. The new procedures will require a change and recodification of the current Rules and Regulations of the Civil Service Commission. The City Manager, with assistance from Human Resources as needed, will work with the Civil Service Commission to bring about those changes by the Civil Service Commission Rules and Regulation Modification Deadline. The Consent Decree Monitor will review these modified procedures solely to ensure they meet the objectives of this section and are not inconsistent with other goals of this Decree using the process set out in Section II.A. Nothing in this section is intended to modify or violate the Aurora City Charter and the duties designated to the Civil Service Commission, the Police Department, and Aurora Fire Rescue.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if the hiring process of police officers and firefighters will have APD and AFR play a far more active role and have the final say on which candidates are hired and that the City has recodified the current Rules and Regulations of the CSC and bring about those change. Confirm that the changes meet the objectives of the Consent Decree and do not modify or violate the Aurora City Charter and the duties designated to the CSC, the Police Department, and Aurora Fire Rescue.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review proposed changes from the City on the hiring process of police officers and firefighters as compared to past procedures. 2. Determine if the revised procedures are consistent with the Subject Matter Expert's (SME's) recommendations and have been adopted by the CSC. 3. Confirm the revised procedures provide for a much more active role of APD in the hiring of candidates from the eligibility lists prepared by the CSC and that APD has the final say on which candidates are hired;

	4. Confirm the revised procedures provide for a much more active role of AFR in the hiring of candidates from the eligibility lists prepared by the CSC and have the final say on which candidates are hired. 5. Confirm the revised procedures are being implemented.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The revised hiring procedures for police officers and firefighters are consistent with the SME's recommendations and have been adopted by the CSC; 2. The revised procedures provide for a much more active role of APD in the hiring of candidates from the eligibility lists prepared by the CSC and APD has the final say on which candidates are hired; 3. The revised procedures provides for a much more active role of AFR in the hiring of candidates from the eligibility lists prepared by the CSC and have the final say on which candidates are hired; and 4. The revised procedures for both APD and AFR are being implemented.
REQUIRED DATA	Draft of the proposed changes to the Rules and Regulations of the Civil Service Commission; self-assessment from the City (or APD, AFR and CSC)
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Civil Service Commission Outside Expert Retention Deadline – 90 days; Recruitment Plan Deadline – 455 days; Civil Service Commission Rules and Regulations Modification Deadline – 455 days; RP 1 (baseline); RP 5; and every other RP thereafter
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 49 at VII A (Page 25) ; Mandate 50 at VII A (Page 25); Mandate 52 at VII B (Page 26); Mandate 54 at VII B (1) (a) (Page 26); Mandate 55 at VII B (1) (a) (Page 26); Mandate 56 at VII B (2) (Page 26); Mandate 57 at VII B (2) (Page 26); Mandate 58 at VII B (3) (Page 26)
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Recruitment, Hiring, and Promotion - Civil Service Commission (Promotion)
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 61 at VII C (2)
TEXT	The Commission will work with the Consent Decree Monitor and the outside expert (see paragraph 4 , below) to make changes, if any, to the promotional process.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if the CSC worked with the Consent Decree Monitor and the outside expert to make changes, if any, to the promotional process to be consistent with the goals and objectives of the Consent Decree.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	Verify that the CSC worked with an appropriate SME and the CD Monitor to formalize/document the procedure for the development, review and implementation processes for any appropriate and necessary changes to the promotional process.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when the CSC has worked with the Monitor and the SME to make all appropriate and necessary changes to the promotional process. Note that implementation component of this mandate is assessed in Mandate 49 Section VII A.
REQUIRED DATA	Data from internal evaluation of leadership selection program; data by race, gender and ethnicity of impact of written and oral exams; data by race, gender and ethnicity of each time CSC lowered requirements for promotions; all quantitative data of interviews and annual evaluations by race, gender and ethnicity; all qualitative sources for supervisor's input, required competencies, and accomplishments of applicants for promotion by race, gender and ethnicity; any and all matrices to monitor the promotion process and its impact on diverse candidates; additional data will be requested based upon review of items 1-6 above; self-assessment from the City (or APD, AFR and CSC)
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	TBD
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 49 at VII A (Page 25); Mandate 50 at VII A (Page 25)
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Recruitment, Hiring, and Promotion - Civil Service Commission (Discipline - Timeliness)
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 62 at VII 3 (a) (Page 28)
TEXT	The Civil Service Commission will update its Rules and Regulations by the Civil Service Commission Rules and Regulations Modification Deadline and this update will include, at a minimum: a. guidelines that substantially reduce the time disciplinary cases take from filing to resolution, including to strongly consider not allowing a full “de novo” review of disciplinary cases and instead handling them as a more appellate style of review within the parameters set forth by the Aurora Charter;
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if the CSC updated its Rules and Regulations to include guidelines that substantially reduce the time disciplinary cases take from filing to resolution. Confirm that the CSC strongly considered not allowing a full “de novo” review of disciplinary cases and instead handling them as a more appellate style of review within the parameters set forth by the Aurora Charter.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review CSC’s Rules and Regulations’ newly developed guidelines that substantially reduce the time disciplinary cases take from filing to resolution 2. Through discussions and review, confirm the CSC strongly considered not allowing a full “de novo” review of disciplinary cases and instead handling them as a more appellate style of review within the parameters set forth by the Aurora Charter.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The CSC has updated its guidelines to reducing the time that disciplinary cases take from filing to resolution; and 2. The CSC has strongly considered not allowing a full "de novo" review and instead handles them in an appellate manner. Note that implementation component of this mandate is assessed in Mandate 49 Section VII A.
REQUIRED DATA	Drafts of the CSC Rules and Regulations; self-assessment of the City or CSC
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A

TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Civil Service Commission Outside Expert Retention Deadline – 90 days; Civil Service Commission Rules and Regulations Modification Deadline – 455 days; RP 1 (baseline); RP 5; and every other RP thereafter
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 49 at VII A (Page 25); Mandate 50 at VII A (Page 25)
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Recruitment, Hiring, and Promotion - Civil Service Commission (Discipline)
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 63 at VII 3 (b) (Page 29)
TEXT	The Civil Service Commission will update its Rules and Regulations by the Civil Service Commission Rules and Regulations Modification Deadline and this update will include, at a minimum: b. requirements about the content of disciplinary decisions, including that discipline decisions include plain statements of the actual allegations, defenses, findings, and basis for the decision so that a member of the public can understand, from that document alone, what gave rise to the discipline and the reasons the Commission affirmed or modified that discipline; and...
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if the CSC updated its Rules and Regulations to include requirements about the content of disciplinary decisions, including that discipline decisions include plain statements of the actual allegations, defenses, findings, and basis for the decision so that a member of the public can understand, from that document alone, what gave rise to the discipline and the reasons the CSC either affirmed or modified that discipline.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review CSC's Rules and Regulations to determine if the contain requirements about the content of disciplinary decisions, including that discipline decisions include plain statements of the actual allegations, defenses, findings, and basis for the decision so that a member of the public can understand, from that document alone, what gave rise to the discipline and the reasons the Commission affirmed or modified that discipline.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when the CSC has updated its Rules and Regulations to mandate that all discipline decisions include plain statements of actual allegations, defenses, findings and the basis of decisions, in plain language. Note that implementation component of this mandate is assessed in Mandate 49 Section VII A.
REQUIRED DATA	Drafts of the CSC Rules and Regulations; matrices for any ongoing monitoring of the impact of the discipline decisioning; self-assessment of the City or CSC
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A

TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Civil Service Commission Outside Expert Retention Deadline – 90 days; Civil Service Commission Rules and Regulations Modification Deadline – 455 days; RP 1 (baseline); RP 5; and every other RP thereafter
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 49 at VII A (Page 25); Mandate 50 at VII A (Page 25)
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Recruitment, Hiring, and Promotion - Civil Service Commission (Discipline)
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 64 at VII (c) (Page 29)
TEXT	The Civil Service Commission will update its Rules and Regulations by the Civil Service Commission Rules and Regulations Modification Deadline and this update will include, at a minimum: c. requirements that as much of the business of the Civil Service Commission as possible be easily accessible to the public by website, including discipline decisions and all requests for continuances, and specific identification of what is not public and the basis for keeping it not public.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if the CSC updated its Rules and Regulations with requirements that as much of the business of the CSC as possible be easily accessible to the public by website, including discipline decisions and all requests for continuances, and specific identification of what is not public and the basis for keeping it not public.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review CSC's Rules and Regulations to confirm the presence of a directive that as much of the business of the CSC as possible be easily accessible to the public by website, including discipline decisions and all requests for continuances, and specific identification of what is not public and the basis for keeping it not public.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The CSC has revised its Rules and Regulations to make all appropriate and legally permissible business of the CSC easily accessible to the public through their website. Note that implementation component of this mandate is assessed in Mandate 66 Section VII C 5.
REQUIRED DATA	Drafts of the CSC Rules and Regulations; self-assessment of the City or CSC
SAMPLE REQUIRED	
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Civil Service Commission Outside Expert Retention Deadline – 90 days; Civil Service Commission Rules and Regulations Modification Deadline – 455 days; RP 1 (baseline); RP 5; and every other RP thereafter
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 49 at VII A (Page 25); Mandate 50 at VII A (Page 25); Mandate 66 at VII C 5 (Page 30)

MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Recruitment, Hiring, and Promotion - Civil Service Commission (Outside Expert)
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 65 at VII C (4) (Page 29)
TEXT	The City or the Civil Service Commission, in consultation with the Consent Decree Monitor, will select and hire an outside expert with expertise in best practices for recruiting and hiring a qualified and diverse public safety workforce of police officers and firefighters within the framework of the authority of the Commission provided by the Charter. This outside expert shall be retained by the Civil Service Commission Outside Expert Retention Deadline.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if the City and/or the CSC selected and hired an outside expert with expertise in best practices for recruiting and hiring a qualified and diverse public safety workforce of police officers and firefighters within the framework of the authority of the CSC provided by the Charter in consultation with the Consent Decree Monitor and by the CSC Outside Expert Retention Deadline.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Confirm that the City has selected and hired an appropriate SME for technical assistance to identify metrics and measurement to assess the level of improvement within the framework of the authority of the Commission provided by the Charter to select such an expert.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when the CSC, in consultation with the Monitor, has selected and hired an appropriate SME to provide technical assistance with expertise in best practices for recruiting and hiring a qualified and diverse public safety workforce.
REQUIRED DATA	Applications of outside expert; self-assessment from the City or CSC
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Civil Service Commission Outside Expert Retention Deadline – 90 days; RP 1
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 49 at VII A (Page 25); Mandate 50 at VII A (Page 25)
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Recruitment, Hiring, and Promotion - Civil Service Commission (Transparency)
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 66 at VII C (5) (Page 30)
TEXT	To improve transparency about the operations of the Commission, the Commission shall conduct as much of its business as possible so that the public may easily access it by website, and specifically identify what is not public and the basis for keeping it not public.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if the CSC conducts as much of its business as possible so that the public may easily access it by website, and specifically identify what is not public and the basis for keeping it not public.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review the operations of CSC 2. Review and confirm that all required information as is specifically listed in the revised and Monitor approved CSC Rules and Regulations, is on a public facing website.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when the CSC conducts as much of its business as possible so that the public can easily access it by website, along with the identification of any and all non-public information and the basis for not publishing that information.
REQUIRED DATA	TBD; and self-assessment from the City or CSC
SAMPLE REQUIRED	N/A
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	TBD
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 49 at VII A (Page 25); Mandate 50 at VII A (Page 25); Mandate 64 at VII (c) (Page 29)
MONITOR FORM(S)	

SECTION VIII –ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY

TITLE	Accountability and Transparency - Objectives
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 67 at VIII A (Page 31)
TEXT	The City will develop systems that permit Aurora Police to regularly and easily identify trends and patterns in the conduct of its officers, including, but not limited to, conduct that repeatedly gives rise to claims of civil liability; conduct or specific officers implicated in multiple citizen or officer complaints; and repeated conduct that suggests a need for further training or policy review. These systems shall have the ability to track, among other things, conduct by officer, supervisor, shift, beat, and district.
MONITOR'S TASK DESCRIPTION	Confirm that the City has implemented a system to regularly and easily review and identify trends and patterns in the conduct of its police officers, including lawsuits, complaints and misconduct, uses of force. The system(s) shall have the ability to track, among other things, conduct by officer, supervisor, shift, beat, and district and identify needs for additional training and/or policy revisions.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review systems developed by the City/APD. 2. Review related policies and/or SOPs 3. Confirm the policies were finalized and disseminated. 4. Review /observe related training/orientation content for adequacy. 5. Confirm that all appropriate APD supervisory staff (sergeant and above) have received the training/orientation. 6. Confirm that training content has been incorporated into the curriculum for newly promoted supervisors. 7. Conduct random testing of relevant events (civil claims, citizen and officer complaints, uses of force) to determine if the system is identifying trends and patterns as expected. 8. Review APD's internal review and accountability processes designed to ensure continued compliance.
COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The City has developed systems that permit APD to identify trends and patterns in the conduct of its officers with indicators including civil liability, complaints, and other repeated conduct. The system has the ability to track among other things, conduct by officer supervisor, shift, beat, and district; 2. The APD has developed and disseminated an internal policy/SOP on the use of the above systems and processes; 3. The APD has developed and delivered sufficient training/orientation to its current and newly promoted supervisors (sergeant and above) on the policy/SOP and use of above systems and processes;

	4. The APD has implemented the above systems and processes as evidenced by the Monitor's testing as described above in the "Monitoring Methodology"; and, 5. The APD has developed an internal review and accountability process to ensure continued compliance.
REQUIRED DATA	Access to developed system(s), related policies, related training/orientation content, related events (claims, complaints, uses of force, arrests, stops, BWC), observations of training, training attendance records, roster, self-assessment from the APD.
SAMPLE REQUIRED	TBD
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	RP 1 (baseline) and every other RP thereafter
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 68 at VIII A (Page 31)
MONITOR FORM(S)	

TITLE	Accountability and Transparency - Goals and Measurements
REFERENCE/PAGE NUMBER	Mandate 68 at VIII B (Page 31)
TEXT	Aurora Police, in consultation with the Consent Decree Monitor and outside experts, will develop a system and process to track and follow the following subject matters for use in decision making and for transparency to the public: 1. Tracking of officers' disciplinary outcomes, 2. Identification of trends or patterns of sustained complaints about officers' law enforcement activities, and 3. Public reporting of data collection. The Police Department and Consent Decree Monitor will develop the initial plan for this data collection by the Initial Measurement Plan Deadline.
TASK DESCRIPTION	Determine if APD developed a system and process to track and follow the following subject matters for use in decision making and for transparency to the public by the Initial Measurement Plan Deadline: 1. Tracking of officers' disciplinary outcomes, 2. Identification of trends or patterns of sustained complaints about officers' law enforcement activities, and 3. Public reporting of data collection.
MONITORING METHODOLOGY	1. Review and evaluate APD's proposed system as submitted in response to Mandate 66 at Section VIII, A to determine if the system contains all required subject matters. 2. Use the Monitor's determination of compliance for Mandate 67 at Section VIII A in assessing related policies/SOPs. 3. Use the Monitor's determination of compliance for Mandate 67 at Section VIII A in assessing related to training content and delivery. 4. Review random relevant events (adjudicated disciplinary matters, reviewed uses of force, stops and arrests, other police activities) compared to APD's system to determine if it is being utilized to track and follow events as expected. 5. Select random relevant events and compare to public reporting mechanism (e.g., public facing website) to determine if data is being reported as required. 6. Review APD's internal review and accountability processes designed to ensure continued compliance.

COMPLIANCE DEFINITION	Compliance will be achieved when: 1. The APD has developed a system that tracks disciplinary outcomes; identifies trends or patterns of sustained complaints about officers' law enforcement activities; 2. The APD is publically reporting all required information; 3. The APD has developed internal policies/SOPs on the use of the above systems and processes; 4. The APD has performed sufficient training/orientation to all appropriate supervisory and investigative staff on the policies/SOPs and use of above systems and processes; 5. The APD has implemented the systems and processes as evidenced by the Monitor's testing as described above in the "Monitoring Methodology"; 6. The APD has developed and implemented an internal review and accountability processes designed to ensure continued compliance.
REQUIRED DATA	Initial Measurement Plan, Access to system, related policies, related training/orientation content, observations of training delivery, related adjudicated events (claims, complaints, uses of force, arrests, stops, BWC), PowerDMS dissemination records, training attendance records; roster; self-assessment from the APD
SAMPLE REQUIRED	TBD
TIMELINE AND SCHEDULE	Initial Measurement Plan Deadline – 365 days; RP 5 and every other RP thereafter
CROSS-REFERENCE(S)	Mandate 67 at VIII A (Page 31)
MONITOR FORM(S)	

APPENDIX F

INTERIM REPORT TO THE PARTIES

BY EMAIL

April 1, 2022

Philip J. Weiser, Attorney General
Eric R. Olson, Solicitor General
Janet Drake, Deputy Attorney, Criminal Justice
Alexa D. Jones, Special Counsel for Civil Rights
Ralph L. Carr Colorado Judicial Center
1300 Broadway, 10th Floor
Denver, CO 80203

Daniel I. Brotzman, Aurora Colorado City Attorney
Julie A. Heckman, Deputy City Attorney
Peter A. Schulte, Public Safety Client Group Manager
City Attorney's Office
15151 E. Alameda Pkwy, Suite 5300
Aurora, CO. 80012

Re: State of Colorado, ex rel. Philip J. Weiser, Attorney General v. City of Aurora (Case Number: 2021CV32026)

Dear Attorney General Weiser and City Attorney Brotzman:

As you are aware, IntegrAssure was engaged as the Independent Consent Decree Monitor ("the Monitor" or the "Monitor Team"), with me serving as the lead Monitor, on February 15, 2022. Prior to filing our first quarterly report with the Court pursuant to section IX-A-5 of the Consent Decree, I wanted to provide you with a formal interim update on the Monitor's activities during our first six weeks of operation. This information, along with activities from the second half of the first quarter of operation, will be captured and reported to the Court and public through our first Quarterly Report which will cover the first full three months of the monitorship (February 15, 2022 through May 15, 2022), and will be delivered to the Court and published on our website on or before July 15, 2022.

Since our appointment as Monitor, we have undertaken a number of activities designed to set the foundation of the Monitorship by establishing a strong relationship with the parties and other stakeholders and establishing the framework of the methodologies that will be employed throughout the Monitorship in order to determine the City's level of compliance with each of the terms of the Consent Decree. We have also engaged in a number of ride-alongs with both APD and AFR and have established a Monitor website for the dissemination of information to the public, and receipt from the public of comments, questions and information. As you know, we have also participated in one public forum with the Community in which we explained the Consent Decree and the role of the Monitor. As an outgrowth of that meeting, and separate meetings with Community leaders, we have established a Community Advisory Council and will be building the membership of the Council in the weeks to come.

Importantly, in all of our activities, we have received exemplary cooperation from the City, the City Attorney's Office, the APD and AFR, as well as the Civil Service Commission, beginning the establishment of good working relationships that I believe will benefit the Monitorship throughout its tenure.

In sum, I believe that we are off to a very good start to achieving the goals of the Decree. In the following portions of this letter, I provide more detail as to each of our activities thus far.

Site Visits

Our first site visit to Aurora came the day after that IntegrAssure was confirmed as the Monitor by the City Council. We arrived on February 15, 2022, and spent three days in Aurora. This initial visit was spent introducing ourselves to various City stakeholders and meeting with the parties. We introduced an additional team member, Ed Dadowski, to the City and AFR. Ed, a former firefighter, who will be interfacing with AFR on their Consent Decree issues. We also met with representatives from the IAFF and the FOP.

Our second site visit began on March 14 with some members of the team remaining in Aurora through March 18. Notable events from that trip included an additional meeting with the IAFF, a public meeting with the Civil Service Commission, and our first “All-Parties Meeting” which will be a monthly event in which we provide updates to the parties relative to our activities and the progress of the City in meeting the mandates of the Consent Decree. (The president of the FOP was present at this meeting, and we will ensure that going forward the president of the IAFF is also invited.) Additionally, during this site visit we met with APD, AFR, and the Civil Service Commission relative to the Methodologies to Aid in the Determination of Compliance (MADCs) discussing the proposed “goal-posts” for each of the various mandates contained in the Decree.

Due to a variety of factors, including the fact that PSP will be in Aurora during the week of April 11, we have pushed our third site visit to the week of April 18th.

Meetings with Stakeholders

The building of relationships with stakeholders is the most important foundational aspect of the Monitor’s work. In order to build these relationships, we have met with the various and diverse stakeholders in Aurora. In total, we have held more than **70** meetings with stakeholders through March 31, 2022. These meetings occurred both while the Monitoring team was on-site in February and March of 2022 and using videoconferencing when not on-site. The meetings ranged from APD and AFR executive leadership, various APD and AFR staff who oversee wide-ranging areas from operations to recruitment, City management, the Internal Police Auditor, the Civil Service Commission, the leadership of FOP and IAFF, community leaders, and the members of the AG’s Office.

Furthermore, to support Aurora’s efforts in achieving the goals under the National Public Safety Partnership (PSP) being funded by the U.S. Department of Justice, the Consent Decree Monitor team met with and will be coordinating with the PSP team in order to reduce the data-request strain on APD and to help ensure that crime reduction efforts are conducted in accordance with the mandates of the Consent Decree. We have reiterated our position that the Consent Decree mandates must and, in our experience, will serve to enhance public safety through crime reduction. Put another way, constitutional and best-practice policing are not in any way at odds with building community trust and enhancing public safety.

In addition to meetings with stakeholders, the Monitor Team also observed **12** APD events and internal meetings in that same time period. As noted above, the cooperation and open access that we have been provided by APD (as well as AFR) has been noteworthy and commendable.

Moreover, Monitor Team members attended **five** public facing events including the aforementioned DOJ-hosted community forum on March 15, 2022. Two other public meetings involved the Civil Service Commission. The first of those took place on March 8th in which introduce the Monitoring Team was introduced to all the sitting Commissioners. After that meeting, a special commission meeting was convened on March 15th to further discuss the Monitor’s approach and the necessary steps in working together with the Commission and its staff.

The Monitor Team was also introduced during City Council’s Public Safety Committee meeting on March 10th and attended a public forum convened by the Crime and Justice Institute on February 15 to solicit the

community's thoughts on which elements and principles should be incorporated in the APD's use of force policy.

Methodologies to Aid in the Determination of Compliance

Key to the success of the Consent Decree is a universal recognition and appreciation of what is required of the City and its agencies in order to reach substantial compliance with each mandate of the Decree. The Methodologies to Aid in Determination of Compliance ("MADCs") are designed to provide that information. The MADCs set forth the definition of substantial compliance for each mandate and proscribes how and when the Monitor will be assessing the degree of compliance as well as the data that will be required from the City for that assessment. The MADCs will serve as the roadmap to substantial compliance focused on the goals of the Decree.

As you know, the Monitor shared a notional draft of the Methodologies to Aid in the Determination of Compliance (MADCs) with the City on March 4th and has since met extensively with the City and its agencies to discuss, clarify, and modify that draft with their input. A new version of the MADCs, as revised through the various meetings noted above, was shared with the AG's Office which delivered their comments. We have circulated a revised a final draft and will be publishing a final version by April 15, 2022.

All-Parties Meeting

The Consent Decree Monitoring team conducted its first all-parties meeting on March 16, 2022. The meeting was attended by the parties and City agency representatives. The meeting is designed to update all those present on the current status of the Decree and the Monitor's work. In addition, it is a venue to address any issues that the parties may have. The meeting will be a combination of in-person and virtual and it will occur in conjunction with the Monitor's monthly site visit.

Ride-alongs

Various members of the Monitor team participated in ride-alongs with APD and AFR. These ride-alongs are extremely valuable as they offer opportunities to engage in frank and candid discussions with officers and firefighters on the issues which the Consent Decree is addressing and the manner in which they are being addressed. Additionally, it allows Monitor Team members to observe first-hand how officers and firefighters conduct themselves in the field. We will be continuing these ride-alongs during each of our future site visits.

Website

The Monitor Team has established a website for the monitorship at auroramonitor.org, a domain which the City secured for this express purpose.

The Monitor Team has been working on designing and developing the website and anticipates a launch date on or before April 15. The website will contain a landing page where the community can learn how the Consent Decree came about, the substance of the Consent Decree, and how the City will be assessed and evaluated during the duration of the Consent Decree. Most importantly, the website will be utilized to inform the public about the progress the City is making toward compliance and to provide the community a platform to directly contact the Monitor with comments, questions or concerns.

Community Engagement

In addition to attending the DOJ-hosted community forum mentioned above, members of the Monitoring team have met with community leaders to prioritize soliciting and encouraging community participation in the monitorship. We are in the midst of establishing a Community Advisory Council which will be comprised of representative members of the community who will provide their input and insight on Decree-related

matters to the Monitor. We anticipate that the membership of the Advisory Council and its duties and responsibilities will be finalized by April 15, 2022.

Organization and structure

The Monitor Team has expended significant resources and time on establishing and implementing both internal and external protocols to ensure efficient and effective communication and data-sharing to meet the mandates and the objectives of the Consent Decree. This investment has yielded a smooth and productive working relationship with the various City stakeholders, and we are confident that this will continue throughout the monitorship.

In sum, during the first 45 days of the Monitorship, we have worked hard to lay the foundation upon which our monitoring efforts and technical assistance can be built. Assuming the cooperation which we have seen to date continues, we are optimistic that the goals of the Decree can be met in a timely fashion and that Aurora can become a model of reform which builds public trust and confidence while at the same time significantly improving public safety and officer wellness.

Sincerely,


Jeff Schlager
Monitor

APPENDIX G

SURVEY RESULTS

Topline_Aurora CO Public Safety and Policing Survey (Wave 1)_May 2022

Total Interviews: 1,164

Question 1

How would you rate the job that police departments across the U.S. are doing?

TOTAL EXCELLENT/GOOD	34%
TOTAL POOR	41%
EXCELLENT	12%
GOOD	21%
FAIR	25%
POOR	21%
VERY POOR	20%

Question 2

How would you rate the job that the Aurora Police Department is doing?

TOTAL EXCELLENT/GOOD	34%
TOTAL POOR	44%
EXCELLENT	15%
GOOD	19%
FAIR	23%
POOR	20%
VERY POOR	24%

Question 3

How would you rate the job that Aurora Fire Rescue is doing?

TOTAL EXCELLENT/GOOD	65%
TOTAL POOR	16%
EXCELLENT	31%
GOOD	34%
FAIR	18%
POOR	8%
VERY POOR	8%

Question 4

Overall, how safe do you feel in your neighborhood?

TOTAL SAFE	64%
TOTAL UNSAFE	36%
VERY SAFE	23%
SOMEWHAT SAFE	41%
SOMEWHAT UNSAFE	25%
VERY UNSAFE	11%

Question 5

The Aurora Police Department take the time to listen to people.

TOTAL AGREE	40%
TOTAL DISAGREE	39%
STRONGLY AGREE	19%
SOMEWHAT AGREE	21%
SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	15%
STRONGLY DISAGREE	24%
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	21%

Question 6

The APD is responsive to the concerns of community members.

TOTAL AGREE	40%
TOTAL DISAGREE	44%
STRONGLY AGREE	17%
SOMEWHAT AGREE	23%
SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	19%
STRONGLY DISAGREE	25%
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	16%

Question 7

The APD works together with community members to solve local problems.

TOTAL AGREE	38%
TOTAL DISAGREE	43%
STRONGLY AGREE	15%
SOMEWHAT AGREE	22%
SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	16%
STRONGLY DISAGREE	27%
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	19%

Question 8

The APD treats people with respect.

TOTAL AGREE	43%
TOTAL DISAGREE	42%
STRONGLY AGREE	20%
SOMEWHAT AGREE	24%
SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	16%
STRONGLY DISAGREE	26%
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	14%

Question 9

The APD treats people fairly.

TOTAL AGREE	43%
TOTAL DISAGREE	43%
STRONGLY AGREE	20%
SOMEWHAT AGREE	23%
SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	17%
STRONGLY DISAGREE	26%
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	14%

Question 10

The APD can be trusted.

TOTAL AGREE	42%
TOTAL DISAGREE	44%
STRONGLY AGREE	20%
SOMEWHAT AGREE	22%
SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	15%
STRONGLY DISAGREE	29%
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	14%

Question 11

The APD reduce crime in my neighborhood.

TOTAL AGREE	36%
TOTAL DISAGREE	48%
STRONGLY AGREE	16%
SOMEWHAT AGREE	20%
SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	21%
STRONGLY DISAGREE	26%
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	16%

Question 12

The APD officers who patrol my neighborhood reflect the racial and ethnic diversity of its residents.

TOTAL AGREE	36%
TOTAL DISAGREE	37%
STRONGLY AGREE	18%
SOMEWHAT AGREE	18%
SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	9%
STRONGLY DISAGREE	28%
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	27%

Question 13

The APD do not allow racial and ethnic biases to affect their actions.

TOTAL AGREE	34%
TOTAL DISAGREE	47%
STRONGLY AGREE	20%
SOMEWHAT AGREE	14%
SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	14%
STRONGLY DISAGREE	33%
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	19%

Question 14

The APD make decisions based on facts and the law and not on their own personal opinions.

TOTAL AGREE	38%
TOTAL DISAGREE	44%
STRONGLY AGREE	19%
SOMEWHAT AGREE	20%
SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	15%
STRONGLY DISAGREE	29%
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	18%

Question 15

The APD only use the amount of force necessary to accomplish their tasks.

TOTAL AGREE	37%
TOTAL DISAGREE	47%
STRONGLY AGREE	18%
SOMEWHAT AGREE	18%
SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	15%
STRONGLY DISAGREE	32%
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	16%

Question 16

The majority of APD officers use de-escalation tactics to avoid or minimize force when it is reasonable and safe to do so.

TOTAL AGREE	38%
TOTAL DISAGREE	41%
STRONGLY AGREE	20%
SOMEWHAT AGREE	18%
SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	16%
STRONGLY DISAGREE	25%
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	20%

Question 17

The APD holds officers accountable for misconduct when it occurs.

TOTAL AGREE	38%
TOTAL DISAGREE	48%
STRONGLY AGREE	20%
SOMEWHAT AGREE	18%
SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	16%
STRONGLY DISAGREE	33%
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	13%

Question 18

Do you generally feel safer or less safe in your neighborhood than you did last year?

TOTAL SAFER	20%
TOTAL LESS SAFE	39%
MUCH SAFER	8%
SOMEWHAT SAFER	12%
SOMEWHAT LESS SAFE	21%
MUCH LESS SAFE	19%
ABOUT THE SAME	41%

Question 19

Compared to last year, how would you say the Aurora Police Department is doing?

TOTAL BETTER	26%
TOTAL WORSE	30%
SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER	12%
SOMEWHAT BETTER	14%
SOMEWHAT WORSE	14%
SIGNIFICANTLY WORSE	16%
ABOUT THE SAME	43%

Question 20

Have you been a victim of crime in the last year?

YES	23%
NO	77%

Question 21

In the past year, have you initiated contact with the Aurora Police Department in any of the following ways? [PLEASE SELECT ALL THAT APPLY]

TO REPORT A CRIME	26%
TO ASK FOR ASSISTANCE	14%
TO REQUEST ANOTHER TYPE OF POLICE SERVICE	10%
TO REPORT A QUALITY-OF-LIFE ISSUE	5%
HAVE NOT INITIATED CONTACT WITH THE AURORA POLICE DEPARTMENT	56%

Question 22_1

How satisfied were you with the interaction? [TO REPORT A CRIME]

TOTAL SATISFIED	42%
TOTAL DISSATISFIED	44%
VERY SATISFIED	27%
SOMEWHAT SATISFIED	15%
SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED	11%
VERY DISSATISFIED	32%
NEITHER SATISFIED NOR DISSATISFIED	15%

Question 22_2

How satisfied were you with the interaction? [TO REPORT A QUALITY-OF-LIFE ISSUE]

TOTAL SATISFIED	46%
TOTAL DISSATISFIED	46%
VERY SATISFIED	26%
SOMEWHAT SATISFIED	20%
SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED	24%
VERY DISSATISFIED	22%
NEITHER SATISFIED NOR DISSATISFIED	9%

Question 22_3

How satisfied were you with the interaction? [TO ASK FOR ASSISTANCE]

TOTAL SATISFIED	41%
TOTAL DISSATISFIED	47%
VERY SATISFIED	18%
SOMEWHAT SATISFIED	23%
SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED	17%
VERY DISSATISFIED	30%
NEITHER SATISFIED NOR DISSATISFIED	12%

Question 22_4

How satisfied were you with the interaction? [TO ASK FOR ANOTHER TYPE OF POLICE SERVICE]

TOTAL SATISFIED	35%
TOTAL DISSATISFIED	44%
VERY SATISFIED	19%
SOMEWHAT SATISFIED	16%
SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED	18%
VERY DISSATISFIED	25%
NEITHER SATISFIED NOR DISSATISFIED	20%

Question 23

In the past year, have you been stopped by the Aurora Police Department?

YES	13%
NO	87%

Question 24

Did the stop occur while you were driving a motor vehicle?

YES	78%
NO	22%

Question 25

During this stop, were you given a ticket?

YES	33%
NO	53%
NOT SURE	14%

Question 26

During this stop, were you arrested?

YES	11%
NO	89%

Question 27

The last time I was stopped, ticketed, or arrested the police had a legitimate reason.

TOTAL AGREE	45%
TOTAL DISAGREE	35%
STRONGLY AGREE	27%
SOMEWHAT AGREE	18%
SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	15%
STRONGLY DISAGREE	20%
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	20%

Question 28

The last time I was stopped, ticketed, or arrested the police adequately explained the reason for their action.

TOTAL AGREE	62%
TOTAL DISAGREE	27%
STRONGLY AGREE	33%
SOMEWHAT AGREE	30%
SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	8%
STRONGLY DISAGREE	19%
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	11%

Question 29

The last time I was stopped or arrested by the Aurora Police Department, the police treated me with respect.

TOTAL AGREE	49%
TOTAL DISAGREE	32%
STRONGLY AGREE	39%
SOMEWHAT AGREE	10%
SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	13%
STRONGLY DISAGREE	19%
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	19%

Question 30

In the past year, have you had contact or interaction with Aurora Fire Rescue?

YES	17%
NO	83%

Question 31

How satisfied were you with the interaction?

TOTAL SATISFIED	79%
TOTAL DISSATISFIED	12%
VERY SATISFIED	63%
SOMEWHAT SATISFIED	16%
SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED	10%
VERY DISSATISFIED	2%
NEITHER SATISFIED NOR DISSATISFIED	9%

Question 32

As you may know, a consent decree has been imposed on the Aurora Police Department and Aurora Fire Rescue mandating certain reforms. How much have you seen, read, or heard about this?

TOTAL A LOT/SOME	36%
TOTAL NOT MUCH/NOTHING	64%
A LOT	13%
SOME	24%
NOT TOO MUCH	24%
NOTHING AT ALL	39%

Table 1-1
 QUESTION 1:
 How would you rate the job that police departments across the U.S. are doing?

BANNER 1

	SEX			AGE			RACE/ETHNICITY						EDUCATION			WARD						BORN IN US	
	TOTAL	M	F	18-39	40-59	60+	W	B/AA	H/L	API	MR/O	HS OR LESS	SOME COLL	COLL+	WARD 1	WARD 2	WARD 3	WARD 4	WARD 5	WARD 6	YES	NO	
BASE=TOTAL SAMPLE	100%	49%	51%	43%	33%	24%	46%	15%	27%	7%	5%	41%	31%	28%	10%	15%	19%	20%	17%	19%	90%	10%	
**D/S (EXCELLENT/GOOD - POOR)	-7%	-4%	-11%	-39%	7%	28%	5%	-22%	-15%	-7%	-38%	-4%	-5%	-14%	-12%	6%	-32%	-6%	-17%	15%	-10%	11%	
TOTAL EXCELLENT/GOOD	34%	37%	31%	21%	39%	49%	40%	25%	33%	28%	15%	36%	34%	31%	35%	38%	19%	31%	30%	50%	33%	42%	
TOTAL POOR	41%	41%	42%	60%	32%	21%	36%	47%	48%	35%	52%	40%	39%	45%	47%	32%	51%	37%	48%	35%	42%	32%	
EXCELLENT	12%	16%	9%	7%	15%	19%	16%	13%	9%	8%	7%	17%	10%	8%	15%	14%	7%	12%	13%	15%	13%	12%	
GOOD	21%	21%	22%	14%	25%	30%	25%	12%	24%	19%	8%	19%	24%	22%	20%	24%	12%	18%	17%	35%	20%	30%	
FAIR	25%	23%	27%	19%	29%	30%	24%	28%	20%	38%	33%	24%	27%	24%	18%	30%	30%	32%	22%	15%	25%	26%	
POOR	21%	21%	21%	25%	22%	12%	20%	31%	17%	12%	34%	24%	17%	20%	21%	21%	17%	23%	23%	20%	22%	12%	
VERY POOR	20%	20%	21%	35%	10%	9%	16%	16%	30%	23%	18%	16%	22%	25%	25%	11%	34%	14%	24%	15%	20%	20%	

Table 2-1
 QUESTION 2:
 How would you rate the job that the Aurora Police Department is doing?

BANNER 1

	SEX			AGE			RACE/ETHNICITY					EDUCATION			WARD						BORN IN US	
	TOTAL	M	F	18-39	40-59	60+	W	B/AA	H/L	API	MR/O	HS OR LESS	SOME COLL	COLL+	WARD 1	WARD 2	WARD 3	WARD 4	WARD 5	WARD 6	YES	NO
BASE=TOTAL SAMPLE	100%	49%	51%	43%	33%	24%	46%	15%	27%	7%	5%	41%	31%	28%	10%	15%	19%	20%	17%	19%	90%	10%
**D/S (EXCELLENT/GOOD - POOR)	-10%	-6%	-14%	-36%	1%	21%	-5%	-19%	-9%	-4%	-39%	2%	-11%	-25%	-7%	-6%	-30%	-8%	-23%	15%	-11%	1%
TOTAL EXCELLENT/GOOD	34%	37%	31%	22%	40%	46%	38%	26%	33%	35%	22%	39%	33%	26%	39%	34%	22%	32%	29%	47%	33%	41%
TOTAL POOR	44%	42%	45%	58%	38%	26%	43%	45%	41%	39%	61%	38%	44%	52%	46%	40%	52%	41%	52%	32%	44%	40%
EXCELLENT	15%	18%	11%	10%	17%	19%	15%	13%	16%	11%	8%	21%	11%	9%	16%	14%	8%	14%	12%	24%	14%	24%
GOOD	19%	18%	20%	12%	23%	27%	23%	13%	17%	23%	14%	18%	22%	17%	24%	20%	14%	19%	17%	23%	19%	17%
FAIR	23%	21%	24%	20%	22%	28%	19%	29%	26%	26%	17%	23%	22%	22%	15%	26%	26%	27%	18%	21%	23%	20%
POOR	20%	20%	20%	22%	22%	14%	23%	25%	14%	14%	22%	19%	17%	25%	21%	23%	21%	18%	24%	16%	20%	23%
VERY POOR	24%	22%	25%	36%	16%	11%	20%	21%	28%	26%	39%	19%	27%	26%	25%	18%	32%	23%	28%	17%	24%	16%

Table 3-1
 QUESTION 3:
 How would you rate the job that Aurora Fire Rescue is doing?

BANNER 1

	SEX			AGE			RACE/ETHNICITY					EDUCATION			WARD						BORN IN US	
	TOTAL	M	F	18-39	40-59	60+	W	B/AA	H/L	API	MR/O	HS OR LESS	SOME COLL	COLL+	WARD 1	WARD 2	WARD 3	WARD 4	WARD 5	WARD 6	YES	NO
BASE=TOTAL SAMPLE	100%	49%	51%	43%	33%	24%	46%	15%	27%	7%	5%	41%	31%	28%	10%	15%	19%	20%	17%	19%	90%	10%
**D/S (EXCELLENT/GOOD - POOR)	49%	55%	43%	55%	44%	46%	55%	31%	47%	47%	56%	46%	52%	50%	65%	44%	25%	50%	51%	64%	51%	35%
TOTAL EXCELLENT/GOOD -----	65%	70%	61%	69%	62%	63%	70%	55%	65%	59%	64%	64%	67%	66%	77%	62%	51%	62%	67%	77%	66%	56%
TOTAL POOR -----	16%	15%	17%	14%	18%	17%	15%	24%	17%	11%	8%	18%	15%	16%	12%	18%	26%	11%	17%	13%	16%	21%
EXCELLENT	31%	35%	27%	33%	25%	34%	31%	27%	33%	23%	35%	34%	31%	27%	43%	30%	21%	27%	29%	39%	30%	38%
GOOD	34%	35%	34%	36%	36%	29%	39%	28%	31%	36%	29%	30%	36%	39%	33%	31%	30%	35%	38%	38%	36%	18%
FAIR	18%	15%	22%	17%	20%	19%	15%	21%	18%	30%	28%	18%	19%	19%	12%	20%	22%	27%	16%	11%	18%	23%
POOR	8%	8%	8%	4%	13%	9%	8%	15%	7%	2%	3%	8%	8%	9%	10%	10%	9%	6%	10%	6%	7%	14%
VERY POOR	8%	7%	10%	10%	5%	8%	7%	9%	10%	9%	4%	10%	7%	7%	2%	8%	18%	5%	7%	7%	8%	7%

Table 4-1
 QUESTION 4:
 Overall, how safe do you feel in your neighborhood?

BANNER 1

	SEX			AGE			RACE/ETHNICITY					EDUCATION			WARD						BORN IN US	
	TOTAL	M	F	18-39	40-59	60+	W	B/AA	H/L	API	MR/O	HS OR LESS	SOME COLL	COLL+	WARD 1	WARD 2	WARD 3	WARD 4	WARD 5	WARD 6	YES	NO
BASE=TOTAL SAMPLE	100%	49%	51%	43%	33%	24%	46%	15%	27%	7%	5%	41%	31%	28%	10%	15%	19%	20%	17%	19%	90%	10%
**D/S (SAFE - UNSAFE)	29%	33%	25%	14%	42%	37%	33%	29%	30%	12%	3%	30%	29%	27%	9%	36%	9%	32%	23%	54%	27%	46%
TOTAL SAFE	64%	66%	62%	57%	71%	69%	67%	65%	65%	56%	52%	65%	64%	63%	55%	68%	54%	66%	62%	77%	63%	73%

TOTAL UNSAFE	36%	34%	38%	43%	29%	31%	33%	35%	35%	44%	48%	35%	36%	37%	45%	32%	46%	34%	38%	23%	37%	27%

VERY SAFE	23%	26%	20%	21%	27%	21%	26%	23%	21%	19%	14%	27%	22%	18%	18%	23%	14%	23%	21%	35%	23%	19%
SOMEWHAT SAFE	41%	40%	43%	36%	44%	48%	41%	42%	44%	37%	38%	38%	43%	46%	37%	45%	41%	43%	40%	42%	40%	54%
SOMEWHAT UNSAFE	25%	26%	25%	31%	21%	22%	23%	28%	27%	24%	31%	26%	24%	26%	28%	25%	31%	26%	26%	16%	27%	11%
VERY UNSAFE	11%	8%	13%	12%	9%	10%	11%	7%	8%	20%	17%	10%	12%	11%	17%	7%	14%	8%	13%	7%	10%	16%

Table 5-1
 QUESTION 5:
 The Aurora Police Department take the time to listen to people.

BANNER 1

	SEX			AGE			RACE/ETHNICITY					EDUCATION			WARD						BORN IN US	
	TOTAL	M	F	18-39	40-59	60+	W	B/AA	H/L	API	MR/O	HS OR LESS	SOME COLL	COLL+	WARD 1	WARD 2	WARD 3	WARD 4	WARD 5	WARD 6	YES	NO
BASE=TOTAL SAMPLE	100%	49%	51%	43%	33%	24%	46%	15%	27%	7%	5%	41%	31%	28%	10%	15%	19%	20%	17%	19%	90%	10%
**D/S (AGREE - DISAGREE)	1%	9%	-7%	-24%	12%	30%	12%	-3%	-9%	2%	-37%	15%	-2%	-16%	-1%	8%	-17%	1%	-11%	23%	-2%	23%
TOTAL AGREE	40%	43%	37%	27%	45%	55%	46%	40%	32%	42%	28%	45%	40%	33%	38%	45%	29%	41%	38%	49%	39%	51%
TOTAL DISAGREE	39%	35%	43%	52%	33%	25%	34%	42%	41%	39%	65%	31%	42%	49%	39%	37%	46%	41%	48%	26%	40%	28%
STRONGLY AGREE	19%	20%	18%	12%	22%	28%	22%	21%	14%	14%	20%	25%	18%	11%	20%	17%	13%	20%	20%	24%	19%	19%
SOMEWHAT AGREE	21%	23%	19%	16%	23%	28%	24%	18%	18%	28%	9%	20%	22%	22%	17%	28%	16%	21%	18%	26%	20%	32%
SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	15%	14%	16%	15%	17%	13%	13%	20%	14%	14%	28%	13%	14%	20%	21%	16%	13%	22%	11%	9%	16%	11%
STRONGLY DISAGREE	24%	21%	28%	37%	16%	12%	21%	22%	27%	26%	37%	18%	28%	29%	17%	21%	32%	19%	38%	17%	25%	17%
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	21%	22%	20%	21%	22%	20%	20%	18%	27%	19%	7%	24%	18%	19%	23%	18%	26%	18%	14%	25%	21%	20%

Table 6-1
 QUESTION 6:
 The APD is responsive to the concerns of community members.

BANNER 1

	SEX			AGE			RACE/ETHNICITY					EDUCATION			WARD						BORN IN US	
	TOTAL	M	F	18-39	40-59	60+	W	B/AA	H/L	API	MR/O	HS OR LESS	SOME COLL	COLL+	WARD 1	WARD 2	WARD 3	WARD 4	WARD 5	WARD 6	YES	NO
BASE=TOTAL SAMPLE	100%	49%	51%	43%	33%	24%	46%	15%	27%	7%	5%	41%	31%	28%	10%	15%	19%	20%	17%	19%	90%	10%
**D/S (AGREE - DISAGREE)	-4%	2%	-8%	-33%	12%	29%	2%	-	-8%	-	-46%	8%	-6%	-17%	1%	-1%	-21%	-7%	-12%	20%	-7%	23%
TOTAL AGREE	40%	43%	37%	26%	47%	57%	46%	42%	32%	41%	25%	46%	39%	34%	42%	44%	28%	40%	38%	50%	39%	51%
TOTAL DISAGREE	44%	42%	46%	59%	36%	28%	44%	42%	40%	41%	71%	38%	46%	51%	41%	45%	50%	47%	50%	30%	46%	28%
STRONGLY AGREE	17%	21%	14%	11%	24%	20%	21%	18%	12%	18%	10%	24%	15%	11%	22%	20%	10%	15%	17%	23%	17%	22%
SOMEWHAT AGREE	23%	23%	23%	15%	23%	37%	24%	24%	21%	23%	15%	22%	24%	22%	19%	24%	18%	25%	22%	27%	22%	30%
SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	19%	18%	19%	22%	18%	14%	20%	21%	13%	16%	34%	18%	18%	21%	20%	25%	19%	25%	16%	10%	20%	9%
STRONGLY DISAGREE	25%	24%	26%	38%	17%	14%	24%	21%	27%	26%	38%	20%	28%	30%	21%	20%	31%	22%	35%	21%	26%	19%
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	16%	15%	17%	15%	17%	15%	10%	16%	27%	17%	3%	17%	15%	16%	17%	12%	22%	13%	11%	20%	15%	21%

Table 7-1
 QUESTION 7:
 The APD works together with community members to solve local problems.

BANNER 1

	SEX			AGE			RACE/ETHNICITY					EDUCATION			WARD						BORN IN US	
	TOTAL	M	F	18-39	40-59	60+	W	B/AA	H/L	API	MR/O	HS OR LESS	SOME COLL	COLL+	WARD 1	WARD 2	WARD 3	WARD 4	WARD 5	WARD 6	YES	NO
BASE=TOTAL SAMPLE	100%	49%	51%	43%	33%	24%	46%	15%	27%	7%	5%	41%	31%	28%	10%	15%	19%	20%	17%	19%	90%	10%
**D/S (AGREE - DISAGREE)	-5%	3%	-13%	-33%	10%	23%	2%	-12%	-6%	-2%	-51%	6%	-9%	-17%	-	5%	-29%	-11%	-11%	17%	-9%	22%
TOTAL AGREE	38%	42%	34%	25%	43%	52%	44%	36%	32%	39%	18%	43%	36%	32%	40%	40%	24%	37%	38%	48%	36%	50%
TOTAL DISAGREE	43%	39%	47%	59%	33%	29%	42%	47%	38%	41%	69%	37%	45%	50%	39%	35%	54%	48%	50%	31%	45%	28%
STRONGLY AGREE	15%	18%	13%	11%	18%	20%	19%	17%	8%	16%	11%	20%	14%	11%	16%	14%	10%	15%	17%	20%	15%	16%
SOMEWHAT AGREE	22%	24%	21%	15%	25%	32%	24%	18%	24%	23%	7%	23%	22%	21%	23%	27%	14%	22%	21%	28%	21%	34%
SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	16%	16%	15%	16%	17%	13%	16%	23%	11%	14%	21%	13%	16%	19%	17%	16%	20%	21%	12%	8%	16%	12%
STRONGLY DISAGREE	27%	23%	32%	42%	16%	16%	26%	24%	27%	27%	48%	24%	29%	31%	22%	19%	33%	27%	37%	22%	29%	15%
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	19%	19%	19%	16%	24%	19%	14%	17%	29%	20%	13%	20%	20%	18%	21%	24%	22%	15%	12%	22%	19%	23%

Table 8-1
 QUESTION 8:
 The APD treats people with respect.

BANNER 1

	SEX			AGE			RACE/ETHNICITY					EDUCATION			WARD						BORN IN US	
	TOTAL	M	F	18-39	40-59	60+	W	B/AA	H/L	API	MR/O	HS OR LESS	SOME COLL	COLL+	WARD 1	WARD 2	WARD 3	WARD 4	WARD 5	WARD 6	YES	NO
BASE=TOTAL SAMPLE	100%	49%	51%	43%	33%	24%	46%	15%	27%	7%	5%	41%	31%	28%	10%	15%	19%	20%	17%	19%	90%	10%
**D/S (AGREE - DISAGREE)	1%	7%	-5%	-27%	15%	32%	11%	-8%	-	-	-52%	18%	-4%	-20%	9%	10%	-19%	-6%	-7%	22%	-3%	33%
TOTAL AGREE	43%	47%	40%	29%	51%	58%	49%	38%	41%	43%	20%	51%	41%	34%	48%	48%	31%	40%	43%	53%	41%	63%
TOTAL DISAGREE	42%	39%	45%	56%	36%	27%	38%	46%	42%	43%	73%	33%	45%	53%	39%	37%	50%	45%	50%	31%	44%	30%
STRONGLY AGREE	20%	23%	16%	12%	24%	28%	26%	17%	12%	17%	13%	25%	17%	15%	20%	20%	14%	15%	22%	27%	20%	20%
SOMEWHAT AGREE	24%	23%	24%	17%	27%	30%	22%	21%	29%	26%	8%	26%	24%	19%	28%	28%	17%	24%	21%	26%	21%	43%
SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	16%	17%	15%	16%	20%	12%	18%	21%	11%	14%	21%	15%	14%	22%	11%	18%	19%	20%	16%	11%	17%	8%
STRONGLY DISAGREE	26%	22%	30%	39%	17%	15%	20%	25%	30%	28%	52%	18%	31%	32%	28%	19%	31%	25%	34%	20%	26%	22%
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	14%	14%	15%	16%	13%	15%	13%	16%	17%	14%	7%	16%	13%	13%	13%	15%	19%	15%	7%	16%	15%	8%

Table 9-1
 QUESTION 9:
 The APD treats people fairly.

BANNER 1

	SEX			AGE			RACE/ETHNICITY					EDUCATION			WARD						BORN IN US	
	TOTAL	M	F	18-39	40-59	60+	W	B/AA	H/L	API	MR/O	HS OR LESS	SOME COLL	COLL+	WARD 1	WARD 2	WARD 3	WARD 4	WARD 5	WARD 6	YES	NO
BASE=TOTAL SAMPLE	100%	49%	51%	43%	33%	24%	46%	15%	27%	7%	5%	41%	31%	28%	10%	15%	19%	20%	17%	19%	90%	10%
**D/S (AGREE - DISAGREE)	-	7%	-8%	-26%	13%	26%	12%	-18%	-2%	-3%	-52%	16%	-7%	-18%	7%	-3%	-15%	-7%	-8%	24%	-2%	12%
TOTAL AGREE	43%	46%	39%	31%	49%	55%	50%	33%	41%	41%	20%	52%	39%	34%	46%	41%	36%	40%	42%	53%	42%	49%
TOTAL DISAGREE	43%	39%	47%	57%	36%	29%	37%	51%	43%	44%	73%	35%	47%	52%	38%	45%	50%	47%	50%	29%	44%	37%
STRONGLY AGREE	20%	24%	16%	13%	24%	27%	26%	16%	13%	15%	13%	25%	18%	15%	28%	16%	14%	17%	20%	27%	20%	16%
SOMEWHAT AGREE	23%	22%	24%	19%	25%	28%	23%	17%	28%	27%	8%	27%	22%	19%	18%	25%	22%	23%	21%	27%	22%	33%
SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	17%	16%	18%	18%	19%	12%	16%	22%	13%	16%	29%	17%	16%	18%	10%	25%	17%	23%	13%	11%	17%	17%
STRONGLY DISAGREE	26%	23%	30%	39%	17%	17%	21%	30%	30%	28%	44%	18%	31%	34%	28%	20%	33%	23%	36%	19%	27%	20%
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	14%	15%	13%	12%	15%	16%	13%	15%	16%	15%	7%	13%	14%	15%	16%	14%	14%	13%	9%	17%	14%	14%

Table 10-1
QUESTION 10:
The APD can be trusted.

BANNER 1

	SEX			AGE			RACE/ETHNICITY						EDUCATION			WARD						BORN IN US	
	TOTAL	M	F	18-39	40-59	60+	W	B/AA	H/L	API	MR/O	HS OR LESS	SOME COLL	COLL+	WARD 1	WARD 2	WARD 3	WARD 4	WARD 5	WARD 6			
																					YES	NO	
BASE=TOTAL SAMPLE	100%	49%	51%	43%	33%	24%	46%	15%	27%	7%	5%	41%	31%	28%	10%	15%	19%	20%	17%	19%	90%	10%	
**D/S (AGREE - DISAGREE)	-1%	5%	-8%	-28%	10%	31%	12%	-24%	-2%	-3%	-52%	10%	-7%	-11%	-2%	5%	-18%	-9%	-10%	25%	-4%	21%	
TOTAL AGREE	42%	46%	38%	29%	47%	59%	50%	32%	38%	45%	21%	45%	41%	39%	41%	46%	32%	39%	39%	56%	41%	50%	
TOTAL DISAGREE	44%	41%	46%	57%	38%	28%	38%	55%	40%	48%	73%	35%	48%	50%	43%	41%	50%	47%	49%	31%	45%	29%	
STRONGLY AGREE	20%	23%	16%	14%	22%	27%	28%	15%	11%	19%	9%	23%	18%	16%	22%	16%	13%	17%	22%	29%	20%	14%	
SOMEWHAT AGREE	22%	23%	22%	15%	26%	32%	22%	17%	26%	26%	12%	22%	23%	22%	19%	30%	19%	22%	17%	28%	21%	36%	
SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	15%	15%	14%	13%	18%	13%	13%	22%	9%	24%	23%	13%	13%	18%	16%	18%	13%	19%	13%	11%	16%	7%	
STRONGLY DISAGREE	29%	26%	32%	44%	20%	15%	25%	33%	31%	24%	50%	22%	35%	32%	27%	23%	37%	28%	36%	21%	30%	22%	
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	14%	13%	16%	15%	15%	13%	12%	13%	22%	8%	6%	19%	11%	11%	16%	13%	19%	14%	12%	12%	14%	21%	

Table 11-1
 QUESTION 11:
 The APD reduce crime in my neighborhood.

BANNER 1

	SEX			AGE			RACE/ETHNICITY						EDUCATION			WARD						BORN IN US	
	TOTAL	M	F	18-39	40-59	60+	W	B/AA	H/L	API	MR/O	HS OR LESS	SOME COLL	COLL+	WARD 1	WARD 2	WARD 3	WARD 4	WARD 5	WARD 6	YES	NO	
BASE=TOTAL SAMPLE	100%	49%	51%	43%	33%	24%	46%	15%	27%	7%	5%	41%	31%	28%	10%	15%	19%	20%	17%	19%	90%	10%	
**D/S (AGREE - DISAGREE)	-12%	-2%	-22%	-36%	1%	13%	-6%	-5%	-19%	-7%	-58%	-4%	-15%	-20%	-1%	-16%	-34%	-13%	-22%	17%	-15%	19%	
TOTAL AGREE	36%	41%	31%	25%	42%	47%	38%	37%	33%	40%	18%	41%	33%	31%	41%	33%	25%	37%	30%	50%	34%	50%	
TOTAL DISAGREE	48%	43%	52%	61%	41%	34%	44%	41%	52%	47%	76%	45%	48%	51%	42%	49%	59%	50%	52%	33%	50%	31%	
STRONGLY AGREE	16%	20%	13%	11%	22%	18%	18%	17%	13%	21%	8%	22%	13%	11%	14%	12%	11%	18%	13%	27%	17%	13%	
SOMEWHAT AGREE	20%	21%	18%	14%	20%	29%	21%	20%	20%	19%	10%	20%	19%	20%	27%	21%	14%	19%	17%	23%	18%	37%	
SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	21%	21%	22%	26%	19%	17%	19%	21%	26%	17%	23%	24%	19%	21%	13%	29%	24%	22%	21%	17%	22%	12%	
STRONGLY DISAGREE	26%	22%	31%	34%	22%	17%	25%	20%	26%	30%	53%	21%	29%	30%	29%	20%	35%	28%	31%	16%	27%	19%	
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	16%	16%	17%	14%	17%	19%	17%	22%	15%	13%	6%	13%	19%	18%	17%	18%	16%	14%	18%	17%	16%	19%	

Table 12-1

QUESTION 12:

The APD officers who patrol my neighborhood reflect the racial and ethnic diversity of its residents.

BANNER 1

	SEX			AGE			RACE/ETHNICITY						EDUCATION			WARD						BORN IN US	
	TOTAL	M	F	18-39	40-59	60+	W	B/AA	H/L	API	MR/O	HS OR LESS	SOME COLL	COLL+	WARD 1	WARD 2	WARD 3	WARD 4	WARD 5	WARD 6	YES	NO	
BASE=TOTAL SAMPLE	100%	49%	51%	43%	33%	24%	46%	15%	27%	7%	5%	41%	31%	28%	10%	15%	19%	20%	17%	19%	90%	10%	
**D/S (AGREE - DISAGREE)	-2%	11%	-13%	-27%	15%	21%	16%	-29%	-5%	-10%	-51%	16%	-7%	-21%	3%	4%	-18%	-5%	-10%	18%	-5%	27%	
TOTAL AGREE	36%	41%	30%	24%	44%	46%	42%	26%	35%	35%	17%	45%	32%	26%	36%	38%	30%	36%	31%	44%	34%	53%	
TOTAL DISAGREE	37%	31%	44%	50%	30%	25%	26%	55%	40%	45%	68%	30%	39%	47%	32%	34%	48%	41%	41%	26%	39%	26%	
STRONGLY AGREE	18%	20%	15%	12%	21%	23%	22%	14%	14%	12%	14%	23%	15%	13%	19%	15%	13%	13%	17%	29%	18%	16%	
SOMEWHAT AGREE	18%	21%	15%	11%	23%	23%	19%	12%	21%	23%	3%	23%	17%	13%	16%	23%	17%	23%	14%	15%	16%	37%	
SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	9%	8%	10%	9%	10%	9%	7%	15%	6%	8%	21%	6%	10%	12%	11%	11%	6%	14%	6%	7%	9%	7%	
STRONGLY DISAGREE	28%	22%	34%	42%	20%	16%	18%	39%	34%	37%	47%	23%	29%	35%	21%	23%	42%	27%	35%	19%	29%	19%	
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	27%	28%	26%	26%	26%	30%	33%	20%	25%	20%	15%	25%	29%	28%	32%	29%	22%	24%	28%	29%	28%	21%	

Table 13-1
 QUESTION 13:
 The APD do not allow racial and ethnic biases to affect their actions.

BANNER 1

	SEX			AGE			RACE/ETHNICITY					EDUCATION			WARD						BORN IN US	
	TOTAL	M	F	18-39	40-59	60+	W	B/AA	H/L	API	MR/O	HS OR LESS	SOME COLL	COLL+	WARD 1	WARD 2	WARD 3	WARD 4	WARD 5	WARD 6	YES	NO
BASE=TOTAL SAMPLE	100%	49%	51%	43%	33%	24%	46%	15%	27%	7%	5%	41%	31%	28%	10%	15%	19%	20%	17%	19%	90%	10%
**D/S (AGREE - DISAGREE)	-12%	-3%	-22%	-39%	3%	13%	5%	-36%	-20%	-13%	-56%	2%	-16%	-30%	-23%	-12%	-27%	-13%	-19%	13%	-15%	13%
TOTAL AGREE	34%	39%	30%	24%	40%	45%	43%	26%	28%	33%	17%	41%	31%	27%	28%	32%	29%	36%	31%	46%	33%	47%
TOTAL DISAGREE	47%	42%	51%	63%	37%	32%	38%	62%	48%	47%	73%	39%	47%	57%	51%	44%	56%	49%	49%	34%	48%	33%
STRONGLY AGREE	20%	24%	16%	15%	24%	23%	28%	19%	10%	15%	13%	26%	17%	14%	20%	16%	16%	20%	20%	28%	21%	15%
SOMEWHAT AGREE	14%	15%	13%	9%	16%	22%	15%	7%	18%	18%	4%	15%	14%	13%	8%	16%	13%	16%	11%	19%	12%	32%
SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	14%	15%	13%	11%	16%	15%	13%	23%	8%	17%	16%	13%	12%	17%	9%	22%	12%	17%	11%	10%	14%	11%
STRONGLY DISAGREE	33%	27%	38%	51%	21%	17%	25%	39%	40%	30%	56%	26%	36%	40%	42%	21%	44%	32%	38%	23%	34%	22%
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	19%	19%	19%	14%	24%	23%	19%	13%	24%	20%	11%	19%	22%	16%	21%	24%	15%	16%	20%	20%	19%	20%

Table 14-1

QUESTION 14:

The APD make decisions based on facts and the law and not on their own personal opinions.

BANNER 1

	SEX			AGE			RACE/ETHNICITY						EDUCATION			WARD						BORN IN US	
	TOTAL	M	F	18-39	40-59	60+	W	B/AA	H/L	API	MR/O	HS OR LESS	SOME COLL	COLL+	WARD 1	WARD 2	WARD 3	WARD 4	WARD 5	WARD 6	YES	NO	
BASE=TOTAL SAMPLE	100%	49%	51%	43%	33%	24%	46%	15%	27%	7%	5%	41%	31%	28%	10%	15%	19%	20%	17%	19%	90%	10%	
**D/S (AGREE - DISAGREE)	-5%	8%	-18%	-30%	5%	24%	11%	-16%	-19%	-2%	-59%	7%	-7%	-21%	-10%	2%	-26%	-5%	-9%	14%	-8%	16%	
TOTAL AGREE	38%	45%	32%	28%	42%	52%	47%	33%	31%	40%	14%	45%	35%	33%	35%	40%	30%	39%	37%	47%	37%	51%	
TOTAL DISAGREE	44%	37%	50%	58%	37%	28%	35%	49%	50%	42%	73%	38%	42%	54%	45%	38%	56%	45%	46%	32%	45%	35%	
STRONGLY AGREE	19%	22%	16%	14%	21%	24%	25%	15%	14%	10%	9%	23%	15%	16%	14%	19%	12%	16%	21%	28%	19%	16%	
SOMEWHAT AGREE	20%	23%	17%	14%	21%	28%	22%	18%	17%	30%	6%	22%	19%	17%	20%	21%	18%	23%	16%	19%	18%	35%	
SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	15%	12%	18%	15%	16%	14%	12%	18%	19%	5%	24%	16%	9%	19%	16%	19%	22%	12%	9%	11%	16%	9%	
STRONGLY DISAGREE	29%	25%	33%	43%	21%	14%	23%	30%	31%	37%	49%	22%	33%	34%	29%	19%	33%	33%	37%	21%	29%	26%	
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	18%	19%	17%	14%	21%	20%	18%	19%	19%	18%	13%	17%	23%	14%	21%	22%	14%	16%	16%	21%	18%	14%	

Table 15-1
 QUESTION 15:
 The APD only use the amount of force necessary to accomplish their tasks.

BANNER 1

	SEX			AGE			RACE/ETHNICITY					EDUCATION			WARD						BORN IN US	
	TOTAL	M	F	18-39	40-59	60+	W	B/AA	H/L	API	MR/O	HS OR LESS	SOME COLL	COLL+	WARD 1	WARD 2	WARD 3	WARD 4	WARD 5	WARD 6	YES	NO
BASE=TOTAL SAMPLE	100%	49%	51%	43%	33%	24%	46%	15%	27%	7%	5%	41%	31%	28%	10%	15%	19%	20%	17%	19%	90%	10%
**D/S (AGREE - DISAGREE)	-11%	-	-21%	-36%	1%	17%	4%	-28%	-15%	-17%	-61%	6%	-18%	-27%	-15%	-1%	-29%	-19%	-13%	13%	-13%	10%
TOTAL AGREE	37%	42%	31%	27%	40%	49%	45%	27%	35%	27%	16%	45%	32%	29%	37%	40%	27%	33%	36%	48%	36%	46%
TOTAL DISAGREE	47%	42%	52%	62%	39%	32%	41%	55%	50%	44%	76%	39%	50%	56%	51%	41%	56%	52%	49%	36%	49%	36%
STRONGLY AGREE	18%	22%	15%	14%	21%	22%	25%	15%	12%	11%	9%	23%	14%	15%	22%	14%	12%	17%	17%	27%	19%	10%
SOMEWHAT AGREE	18%	20%	17%	13%	19%	27%	20%	12%	22%	16%	7%	22%	18%	14%	15%	26%	15%	15%	19%	21%	16%	36%
SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	15%	12%	17%	15%	17%	12%	13%	18%	15%	17%	15%	15%	12%	18%	18%	16%	16%	17%	14%	11%	15%	13%
STRONGLY DISAGREE	32%	30%	35%	48%	22%	19%	28%	37%	34%	27%	61%	25%	38%	38%	33%	26%	40%	35%	35%	25%	34%	23%
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	16%	16%	16%	11%	20%	19%	14%	18%	16%	29%	8%	16%	18%	15%	12%	19%	17%	16%	15%	16%	16%	18%

Table 16-1

QUESTION 16:

The majority of APD officers use de-escalation tactics to avoid or minimize force when it is reasonable and safe to do so.

BANNER 1

	SEX			AGE			RACE/ETHNICITY					EDUCATION			WARD						BORN IN US	
	TOTAL	M	F	18-39	40-59	60+	W	B/AA	H/L	API	MR/O	HS OR LESS	SOME COLL	COLL+	WARD 1	WARD 2	WARD 3	WARD 4	WARD 5	WARD 6	YES	NO
BASE=TOTAL SAMPLE	100%	49%	51%	43%	33%	24%	46%	15%	27%	7%	5%	41%	31%	28%	10%	15%	19%	20%	17%	19%	90%	10%
**D/S (AGREE - DISAGREE)	-3%	8%	-13%	-29%	7%	30%	14%	-10%	-22%	6%	-47%	6%	-5%	-14%	-7%	3%	-21%	-9%	-6%	22%	-4%	10%
TOTAL AGREE	38%	44%	33%	28%	40%	54%	48%	37%	26%	43%	22%	42%	38%	33%	37%	39%	33%	35%	38%	48%	38%	43%
TOTAL DISAGREE	41%	36%	47%	57%	33%	25%	33%	47%	48%	37%	69%	36%	43%	48%	43%	36%	54%	44%	44%	26%	42%	33%
STRONGLY AGREE	20%	24%	17%	14%	25%	25%	27%	19%	12%	17%	13%	25%	19%	15%	20%	16%	15%	19%	21%	29%	21%	14%
SOMEWHAT AGREE	18%	20%	16%	14%	15%	30%	21%	18%	14%	25%	9%	17%	19%	18%	17%	23%	18%	16%	17%	19%	17%	29%
SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	16%	14%	18%	17%	18%	11%	14%	18%	18%	16%	19%	18%	11%	19%	11%	18%	23%	18%	14%	10%	16%	14%
STRONGLY DISAGREE	25%	22%	28%	39%	15%	14%	20%	29%	30%	21%	50%	18%	32%	29%	32%	18%	31%	26%	30%	16%	26%	19%
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	20%	21%	20%	15%	27%	21%	19%	16%	27%	21%	10%	22%	19%	19%	20%	25%	13%	21%	18%	26%	20%	25%

Table 17-1
 QUESTION 17:
 The APD holds officers accountable for misconduct when it occurs.

BANNER 1

	SEX			AGE			RACE/ETHNICITY					EDUCATION			WARD						BORN IN US	
	TOTAL	M	F	18-39	40-59	60+	W	B/AA	H/L	API	MR/O	HS OR LESS	SOME COLL	COLL+	WARD 1	WARD 2	WARD 3	WARD 4	WARD 5	WARD 6	YES	NO
BASE=TOTAL SAMPLE	100%	49%	51%	43%	33%	24%	46%	15%	27%	7%	5%	41%	31%	28%	10%	15%	19%	20%	17%	19%	90%	10%
**D/S (AGREE - DISAGREE)	-10%	-3%	-17%	-37%	5%	16%	1%	-23%	-15%	-3%	-54%	-1%	-12%	-23%	-2%	-11%	-24%	-16%	-19%	13%	-12%	7%
TOTAL AGREE	38%	42%	34%	25%	46%	51%	44%	33%	36%	37%	18%	45%	36%	30%	43%	37%	31%	36%	31%	53%	37%	45%
TOTAL DISAGREE	48%	46%	51%	62%	40%	35%	43%	56%	51%	40%	71%	46%	47%	53%	44%	49%	55%	52%	50%	40%	50%	39%
STRONGLY AGREE	20%	23%	17%	13%	26%	25%	26%	15%	15%	17%	12%	26%	17%	15%	21%	17%	14%	18%	20%	30%	21%	12%
SOMEWHAT AGREE	18%	19%	17%	13%	20%	26%	18%	17%	20%	20%	6%	20%	19%	15%	22%	20%	17%	17%	11%	23%	16%	34%
SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	16%	14%	17%	14%	18%	15%	14%	19%	18%	10%	14%	19%	13%	13%	8%	22%	17%	19%	10%	15%	15%	20%
STRONGLY DISAGREE	33%	32%	33%	48%	22%	20%	29%	37%	33%	30%	57%	27%	34%	40%	36%	27%	38%	32%	40%	25%	34%	19%
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	13%	12%	15%	12%	14%	14%	13%	11%	13%	23%	11%	8%	17%	16%	13%	14%	14%	13%	20%	7%	13%	16%

Table 18-1

QUESTION 18:

Do you generally feel safer or less safe in your neighborhood than you did last year?

BANNER 1

	SEX			AGE			RACE/ETHNICITY					EDUCATION			WARD						BORN IN US	
	TOTAL	M	F	18-39	40-59	60+	W	B/AA	H/L	API	MR/O	HS OR LESS	SOME COLL	COLL+	WARD 1	WARD 2	WARD 3	WARD 4	WARD 5	WARD 6	YES	NO
BASE=TOTAL SAMPLE	100%	49%	51%	43%	33%	24%	46%	15%	27%	7%	5%	41%	31%	28%	10%	15%	19%	20%	17%	19%	90%	10%
**D/S (SAFER - LESS SAFE)	-20%	-16%	-23%	-21%	-22%	-14%	-25%	-18%	-5%	-15%	-64%	-12%	-18%	-33%	-19%	-21%	-21%	-22%	-32%	-5%	-21%	-7%
TOTAL SAFER -----	20%	24%	15%	17%	20%	25%	18%	20%	24%	23%	6%	26%	19%	12%	21%	23%	19%	23%	13%	20%	18%	31%
TOTAL LESS SAFE -----	39%	40%	39%	38%	42%	39%	43%	37%	28%	38%	70%	38%	37%	45%	39%	43%	40%	45%	45%	25%	40%	37%
MUCH SAFER	8%	11%	5%	7%	7%	11%	8%	11%	7%	7%	-	12%	6%	4%	13%	7%	7%	7%	6%	10%	8%	6%
SOMEWHAT SAFER	12%	13%	10%	10%	12%	14%	10%	9%	16%	15%	6%	14%	13%	7%	8%	16%	12%	16%	7%	10%	10%	25%
SOMEWHAT LESS SAFE	21%	23%	19%	17%	26%	19%	24%	20%	14%	13%	39%	21%	16%	26%	18%	26%	17%	28%	22%	13%	20%	23%
MUCH LESS SAFE	19%	17%	20%	21%	15%	20%	20%	17%	14%	24%	32%	16%	21%	19%	21%	17%	23%	17%	23%	12%	19%	14%
ABOUT THE SAME	41%	36%	46%	45%	39%	36%	38%	43%	48%	40%	23%	37%	44%	44%	40%	34%	41%	32%	42%	55%	42%	32%

Table 19-1

QUESTION 19:

Compared to last year, how would you say the Aurora Police Department is doing?

BANNER 1

	SEX			AGE			RACE/ETHNICITY					EDUCATION			WARD						BORN IN US	
	TOTAL	M	F	18-39	40-59	60+	W	B/AA	H/L	API	MR/O	HS OR LESS	SOME COLL	COLL+	WARD 1	WARD 2	WARD 3	WARD 4	WARD 5	WARD 6	YES	NO
BASE=TOTAL SAMPLE	100%	49%	51%	43%	33%	24%	46%	15%	27%	7%	5%	41%	31%	28%	10%	15%	19%	20%	17%	19%	90%	10%
**D/S (BETTER - WORSE)	-4%	1%	-9%	-18%	4%	10%	1%	-12%	1%	-6%	-46%	1%	-	-17%	4%	-7%	-10%	-2%	-17%	9%	-6%	8%
TOTAL BETTER -----	26%	29%	24%	17%	31%	36%	28%	22%	28%	29%	9%	32%	26%	17%	26%	26%	21%	30%	23%	31%	25%	37%
TOTAL WORSE -----	30%	27%	33%	36%	27%	26%	27%	34%	28%	35%	55%	32%	26%	34%	22%	33%	32%	31%	40%	22%	30%	29%
SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER	12%	14%	10%	7%	16%	16%	13%	15%	14%	5%	4%	19%	9%	6%	14%	10%	10%	13%	11%	15%	12%	10%
SOMEWHAT BETTER	14%	15%	13%	10%	15%	20%	16%	7%	15%	24%	5%	14%	17%	11%	12%	16%	11%	17%	11%	16%	13%	28%
SOMEWHAT WORSE	14%	11%	17%	16%	14%	12%	13%	16%	14%	14%	19%	17%	9%	17%	5%	19%	18%	15%	15%	10%	14%	15%
SIGNIFICANTLY WORSE	16%	16%	16%	20%	13%	14%	14%	18%	13%	21%	36%	15%	17%	17%	17%	14%	13%	17%	24%	12%	16%	14%
ABOUT THE SAME	43%	44%	43%	47%	43%	39%	45%	44%	44%	36%	37%	36%	48%	49%	52%	41%	47%	39%	38%	47%	45%	34%

Table 20-1
 QUESTION 20:
 Have you been a victim of crime in the last year?

BANNER 1

	SEX			AGE			RACE/ETHNICITY					EDUCATION			WARD						BORN IN US	
	TOTAL	M	F	18-39	40-59	60+	W	B/AA	H/L	API	MR/O	HS LESS	SOME COLL	COLL+	WARD 1	WARD 2	WARD 3	WARD 4	WARD 5	WARD 6	YES	NO
BASE=TOTAL SAMPLE	100%	49%	51%	43%	33%	24%	46%	15%	27%	7%	5%	41%	31%	28%	10%	15%	19%	20%	17%	19%	90%	10%
**D/S (YES - NO)	-54%	-51%	-56%	-41%	-63%	-62%	-44%	-71%	-69%	-34%	-39%	-54%	-53%	-53%	-44%	-68%	-59%	-49%	-39%	-59%	-53%	-58%
YES	23%	24%	22%	29%	18%	19%	28%	15%	16%	33%	31%	23%	23%	23%	28%	16%	20%	26%	31%	20%	23%	21%
NO	77%	76%	78%	71%	82%	81%	72%	85%	84%	67%	69%	77%	77%	77%	72%	84%	80%	74%	69%	80%	77%	79%

Table 21-1

QUESTION 21:

In the past year, have you initiated contact with the Aurora Police Department in any of the following ways? [PLEASE SELECT ALL THAT APPLY]

BANNER 1

	SEX			AGE			RACE/ETHNICITY					EDUCATION			WARD						BORN IN US	
	TOTAL	M	F	18-39	40-59	60+	W	B/AA	H/L	API	MR/O	HS OR LESS	SOME COLL	COLL+	WARD 1	WARD 2	WARD 3	WARD 4	WARD 5	WARD 6	YES	NO
BASE=TOTAL SAMPLE	100%	49%	51%	43%	33%	24%	46%	15%	27%	7%	5%	41%	31%	28%	10%	15%	19%	20%	17%	19%	90%	10%
TO REPORT A CRIME	26%	26%	27%	30%	25%	23%	29%	20%	21%	30%	36%	29%	22%	27%	40%	20%	20%	25%	35%	25%	27%	24%
TO ASK FOR ASSISTANCE	14%	12%	15%	13%	14%	13%	15%	14%	11%	12%	21%	15%	12%	12%	18%	8%	15%	16%	15%	11%	14%	12%
TO REQUEST ANOTHER TYPE OF POLICE SERVICE	10%	7%	11%	10%	11%	6%	8%	6%	8%	23%	18%	7%	12%	10%	5%	12%	9%	9%	16%	5%	9%	16%
TO REPORT A QUALITY-OF-LIFE ISSUE	5%	5%	5%	4%	5%	6%	5%	3%	3%	12%	3%	4%	5%	6%	7%	3%	4%	4%	8%	4%	4%	6%
HAVE NOT INITIATED CONTACT WITH THE AURORA POLICE DEPARTMENT	56%	58%	53%	56%	52%	58%	53%	66%	61%	43%	43%	55%	57%	56%	38%	62%	60%	58%	43%	64%	56%	49%

Table 22-1
 QUESTION 22.1:
 How satisfied were you with the interaction?

BANNER 1

	SEX			AGE			RACE/ETHNICITY						EDUCATION			WARD						BORN IN US	
	TOTAL	M	F	18-39	40-59	60+	W	B/AA	H/L	API	MR/O	HS OR LESS	SOME COLL	COLL+	WARD 1	WARD 2	WARD 3	WARD 4	WARD 5	WARD 6	YES	NO	
BASE=REPORT A CRIME Q.21	100%	48%	52%	48%	31%	21%	52%	12%	22%	8%	7%	46%	26%	28%	16%	12%	14%	19%	22%	18%	90%	10%	
**D/S (SATISFIED - DISSATISFIED)	-2%	-12%	7%	-15%	6%	15%	-11%	28%	25%	-42%	-27%	12%	-22%	-7%	8%	-12%	-4%	-19%	-33%	51%	-6%	33%	
TOTAL SATISFIED	42%	40%	43%	35%	47%	50%	38%	62%	55%	23%	13%	49%	32%	39%	50%	36%	40%	28%	26%	72%	39%	66%	
TOTAL DISSATISFIED	44%	52%	36%	50%	41%	34%	49%	34%	30%	66%	40%	37%	54%	46%	42%	48%	44%	47%	59%	21%	45%	32%	
VERY SATISFIED	27%	23%	31%	17%	39%	32%	26%	46%	25%	23%	10%	33%	20%	23%	40%	29%	25%	13%	19%	40%	28%	15%	
SOMEWHAT SATISFIED	15%	17%	12%	17%	8%	18%	12%	16%	29%	-	2%	15%	12%	16%	10%	7%	15%	15%	7%	32%	11%	50%	
SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED	11%	16%	7%	11%	16%	4%	17%	4%	9%	-	5%	10%	13%	12%	8%	8%	10%	21%	15%	4%	13%	1%	
VERY DISSATISFIED	32%	36%	29%	38%	25%	30%	32%	29%	21%	66%	35%	27%	41%	34%	33%	40%	35%	26%	44%	17%	33%	31%	
NEITHER SATISFIED NOR DISSATISFIED	15%	8%	21%	15%	12%	16%	13%	4%	15%	11%	48%	15%	14%	15%	8%	15%	15%	26%	15%	7%	16%	2%	

Table 23-1
 QUESTION 22.2:
 How satisfied were you with the interaction?

BANNER 1

	SEX			AGE			RACE/ETHNICITY					EDUCATION			WARD						BORN IN US	
	TOTAL	M	F	18-39	40-59	60+	W	B/AA	H/L	API	MR/O	HS OR LESS	SOME COLL	COLL+	WARD 1	WARD 2	WARD 3	WARD 4	WARD 5	WARD 6	YES	NO
BASE=REPORT QUALITY OF LIFE ISSUE Q.21	100%	51%	49%	32%	34%	34%	49%	10%	19%	18%	4%	31%	32%	37%	15%	9%	18%	16%	27%	15%	86%	14%
**D/S (SATISFIED - DISSATISFIED)	-	-22%	22%	28%	4%	-32%	24%	46%	-3%	-66%	-100%	-14%	-3%	14%	56%	26%	39%	-36%	-56%	21%	11%	-66%
TOTAL SATISFIED	46%	36%	56%	64%	47%	26%	54%	69%	48%	17%	-	39%	43%	54%	73%	50%	68%	25%	18%	60%	50%	17%
TOTAL DISSATISFIED	46%	57%	34%	36%	43%	58%	30%	24%	52%	83%	100%	53%	45%	40%	17%	23%	30%	61%	74%	40%	39%	83%
VERY SATISFIED	26%	23%	28%	35%	22%	20%	39%	52%	5%	-	-	31%	36%	12%	47%	-	55%	22%	8%	22%	30%	-
SOMEWHAT SATISFIED	20%	13%	28%	29%	25%	6%	14%	17%	43%	17%	-	8%	7%	42%	26%	50%	14%	4%	10%	38%	21%	17%
SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED	24%	33%	14%	11%	12%	47%	11%	-	19%	61%	100%	45%	7%	21%	12%	-	2%	25%	57%	13%	14%	83%
VERY DISSATISFIED	22%	24%	20%	25%	30%	11%	19%	24%	33%	22%	-	8%	39%	19%	5%	23%	27%	36%	17%	27%	26%	-
NEITHER SATISFIED NOR DISSATISFIED	9%	7%	11%	-	10%	15%	16%	7%	-	-	-	8%	12%	7%	10%	27%	2%	13%	8%	-	10%	-

Table 24-1
 QUESTION 22.3:
 How satisfied were you with the interaction?

BANNER 1

	SEX			AGE			RACE/ETHNICITY						EDUCATION			WARD						BORN IN US	
	TOTAL	M	F	18-39	40-59	60+	W	B/AA	H/L	API	MR/O	HS OR LESS	SOME COLL	COLL+	WARD 1	WARD 2	WARD 3	WARD 4	WARD 5	WARD 6	YES	NO	
BASE=ASK FOR ASSISTANCE Q.21	100%	43%	57%	42%	34%	24%	50%	15%	22%	6%	8%	46%	28%	25%	14%	9%	21%	23%	18%	15%	91%	9%	
**D/S (SATISFIED - DISSATISFIED)	-6%	11%	-18%	-48%	14%	40%	12%	2%	-34%	15%	-72%	16%	-17%	-33%	31%	-6%	-47%	-3%	-24%	35%	-13%	67%	
TOTAL SATISFIED	41%	48%	36%	21%	49%	66%	47%	43%	33%	52%	12%	52%	36%	27%	59%	24%	22%	48%	34%	60%	37%	80%	
TOTAL DISSATISFIED	47%	37%	55%	69%	35%	26%	36%	42%	67%	37%	85%	36%	54%	60%	28%	31%	69%	51%	59%	25%	51%	13%	
VERY SATISFIED	18%	17%	19%	13%	19%	25%	28%	20%	-	-	12%	27%	8%	12%	8%	17%	7%	18%	15%	46%	19%	8%	
SOMEWHAT SATISFIED	23%	31%	18%	8%	29%	41%	19%	24%	33%	52%	-	25%	28%	15%	51%	7%	15%	30%	20%	14%	19%	71%	
SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED	17%	9%	24%	16%	19%	19%	8%	27%	21%	-	62%	22%	13%	14%	7%	8%	43%	25%	1%	5%	19%	-	
VERY DISSATISFIED	30%	28%	31%	53%	17%	7%	27%	15%	46%	37%	23%	14%	40%	47%	21%	22%	27%	26%	58%	20%	31%	13%	
NEITHER SATISFIED NOR DISSATISFIED	12%	16%	9%	10%	16%	7%	17%	15%	-	10%	3%	12%	10%	13%	13%	45%	8%	2%	7%	15%	12%	7%	

Table 25-1
 QUESTION 22.4:
 How satisfied were you with the interaction?

BANNER 1

	SEX			AGE			RACE/ETHNICITY					EDUCATION			WARD						BORN IN US	
	TOTAL	M	F	18-39	40-59	60+	W	B/AA	H/L	API	MR/O	HS OR LESS	SOME COLL	COLL+	WARD 1	WARD 2	WARD 3	WARD 4	WARD 5	WARD 6	YES	NO
BASE=ANOTHER SERVICE Q.21	100%	38%	62%	46%	38%	16%	40%	10%	24%	17%	10%	32%	40%	28%	6%	20%	17%	19%	27%	10%	83%	17%
**D/S (SATISFIED - DISSATISFIED)	-8%	-17%	-3%	-7%	-16%	7%	-5%	73%	-14%	-56%	-7%	-37%	15%	-9%	-66%	24%	-7%	-13%	-3%	-43%	2%	-60%
TOTAL SATISFIED	35%	31%	38%	33%	34%	46%	38%	80%	39%	9%	14%	20%	47%	35%	3%	56%	36%	13%	45%	26%	39%	18%
TOTAL DISSATISFIED	44%	48%	41%	40%	49%	39%	43%	7%	53%	65%	21%	57%	32%	44%	69%	33%	43%	27%	48%	70%	37%	78%
VERY SATISFIED	19%	11%	23%	24%	8%	28%	26%	30%	23%	-	-	16%	22%	17%	-	18%	17%	3%	41%	5%	22%	3%
SOMEWHAT SATISFIED	16%	20%	14%	8%	26%	17%	12%	51%	16%	9%	14%	4%	25%	18%	3%	38%	19%	10%	4%	21%	17%	15%
SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED	18%	23%	16%	10%	22%	33%	21%	7%	27%	9%	14%	37%	6%	15%	46%	28%	21%	16%	4%	23%	13%	47%
VERY DISSATISFIED	25%	25%	25%	31%	27%	6%	22%	-	26%	56%	7%	20%	26%	29%	23%	4%	22%	11%	45%	46%	24%	31%
NEITHER SATISFIED NOR DISSATISFIED	20%	18%	21%	24%	17%	15%	19%	-	7%	26%	66%	23%	20%	17%	7%	11%	22%	60%	7%	4%	23%	4%

Table 26-1

QUESTION 23:

In the past year, have you been stopped by the Aurora Police Department?

BANNER 1

	SEX			AGE			RACE/ETHNICITY					EDUCATION			WARD						BORN IN US	
	TOTAL	M	F	18-39	40-59	60+	W	B/AA	H/L	API	MR/O	HS OR LESS	SOME COLL	COLL+	WARD 1	WARD 2	WARD 3	WARD 4	WARD 5	WARD 6	YES	NO
BASE=TOTAL SAMPLE	100%	49%	51%	43%	33%	24%	46%	15%	27%	7%	5%	41%	31%	28%	10%	15%	19%	20%	17%	19%	90%	10%
**D/S (YES - NO)	-75%	-65%	-84%	-61%	-82%	-88%	-83%	-53%	-70%	-83%	-74%	-75%	-69%	-81%	-77%	-70%	-77%	-75%	-86%	-65%	-74%	-81%
YES	13%	17%	8%	19%	9%	6%	9%	24%	15%	9%	13%	13%	15%	10%	12%	15%	12%	13%	7%	17%	13%	9%
NO	87%	83%	92%	81%	91%	94%	91%	76%	85%	91%	87%	87%	85%	90%	88%	85%	88%	87%	93%	83%	87%	91%

Table 27-1
 QUESTION 24:
 Did the stop occur while you were driving a motor vehicle?

BANNER 1

	SEX			AGE			RACE/ETHNICITY						EDUCATION			WARD						BORN IN US	
	TOTAL	M	F	18-39	40-59	60+	W	B/AA	H/L	API	MR/O	HS OR LESS	SOME COLL	COLL+	WARD 1	WARD 2	WARD 3	WARD 4	WARD 5	WARD 6	YES	NO	
BASE=YES Q.23	100%	67%	33%	65%	24%	11%	31%	28%	31%	5%	5%	41%	38%	21%	9%	18%	17%	20%	9%	26%	92%	8%	
**D/S (YES - NO)	57%	57%	56%	46%	74%	83%	84%	75%	-	100%	100%	46%	60%	70%	40%	57%	68%	89%	78%	24%	60%	15%	
YES	78%	78%	78%	73%	87%	91%	92%	87%	50%	100%	100%	73%	80%	85%	70%	78%	84%	94%	89%	62%	80%	58%	
NO	22%	22%	22%	27%	13%	9%	8%	13%	50%	-	-	27%	20%	15%	30%	22%	16%	6%	11%	38%	20%	42%	

Table 28-1
 QUESTION 25:
 During this stop, were you given a ticket?

BANNER 1

	SEX			AGE			RACE/ETHNICITY					EDUCATION			WARD						BORN IN US	
	TOTAL	M	F	18-39	40-59	60+	W	B/AA	H/L	API	MR/O	HS OR LESS	SOME COLL	COLL+	WARD 1	WARD 2	WARD 3	WARD 4	WARD 5	WARD 6	YES	NO
BASE=YES Q.23	100%	67%	33%	65%	24%	11%	31%	28%	31%	5%	5%	41%	38%	21%	9%	18%	17%	20%	9%	26%	92%	8%
**D/S (YES - NO)	-20%	-18%	-23%	-17%	-39%	2%	5%	-18%	-47%	-57%	22%	-10%	-32%	-16%	-70%	-17%	-35%	8%	-9%	-18%	-16%	-59%
YES	33%	34%	31%	32%	27%	51%	52%	38%	7%	21%	61%	31%	30%	42%	15%	42%	27%	45%	46%	24%	34%	20%
NO	53%	52%	54%	49%	65%	48%	47%	55%	54%	79%	39%	42%	62%	58%	85%	58%	62%	38%	54%	42%	50%	80%
NOT SURE	14%	14%	16%	19%	8%	1%	-	7%	39%	-	-	27%	8%	1%	-	-	11%	17%	-	34%	16%	-

Table 29-1
 QUESTION 26:
 During this stop, were you arrested?

BANNER 1

	SEX			AGE			RACE/ETHNICITY					EDUCATION			WARD						BORN IN US	
	TOTAL	M	F	18-39	40-59	60+	W	B/AA	H/L	API	MR/O	HS LESS	SOME COLL	COLL+	WARD 1	WARD 2	WARD 3	WARD 4	WARD 5	WARD 6	YES	NO
BASE=YES Q.23	100%	67%	33%	65%	24%	11%	31%	28%	31%	5%	5%	41%	38%	21%	9%	18%	17%	20%	9%	26%	92%	8%
**D/S (YES - NO)	-78%	-70%	-94%	-69%	-94%	-94%	-92%	-99%	-38%	-100%	-100%	-56%	-96%	-87%	-100%	-93%	-100%	-95%	-93%	-26%	-76%	-95%
YES	11%	15%	3%	16%	2%	3%	4%	-	31%	-	-	22%	2%	5%	-	3%	-	2%	3%	37%	12%	-
NO	89%	85%	97%	84%	96%	97%	96%	99%	69%	100%	100%	78%	98%	93%	100%	95%	100%	98%	97%	63%	88%	95%
NOT SURE	-	1%	-	-	2%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	5%

Table 30-1

QUESTION 27:

The last time I was stopped, ticketed, or arrested the police had a legitimate reason.

BANNER 1

	SEX			AGE			RACE/ETHNICITY						EDUCATION			WARD						BORN IN US	
	TOTAL	M	F	18-39	40-59	60+	W	B/AA	H/L	API	MR/O	HS OR LESS	SOME COLL	COLL+	WARD 1	WARD 2	WARD 3	WARD 4	WARD 5	WARD 6	YES	NO	
BASE=YES Q.23	100%	67%	33%	65%	24%	11%	31%	28%	31%	5%	5%	41%	38%	21%	9%	18%	17%	20%	9%	26%	92%	8%	
**D/S (AGREE - DISAGREE)	10%	9%	13%	3%	30%	17%	41%	3%	-8%	10%	-16%	58%	-15%	-36%	-46%	-3%	44%	8%	-15%	28%	18%	-79%	
TOTAL AGREE	45%	41%	55%	38%	62%	51%	61%	50%	30%	31%	32%	63%	39%	23%	24%	46%	71%	51%	19%	41%	49%	4%	
TOTAL DISAGREE	35%	32%	41%	36%	32%	35%	20%	47%	39%	21%	48%	5%	54%	59%	70%	48%	26%	43%	34%	13%	31%	83%	
STRONGLY AGREE	27%	24%	33%	14%	54%	45%	45%	25%	20%	-	-	39%	18%	20%	19%	46%	30%	5%	6%	39%	29%	4%	
SOMEWHAT AGREE	18%	17%	22%	24%	8%	7%	17%	24%	10%	31%	32%	24%	21%	4%	6%	-	41%	46%	13%	2%	20%	-	
SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	15%	14%	17%	18%	13%	2%	8%	16%	16%	21%	39%	-	29%	19%	21%	32%	11%	20%	15%	-	16%	9%	
STRONGLY DISAGREE	20%	18%	24%	18%	20%	33%	13%	31%	22%	-	9%	5%	25%	40%	49%	17%	15%	23%	19%	13%	15%	74%	
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	20%	27%	4%	26%	5%	14%	18%	3%	31%	47%	20%	32%	7%	18%	6%	6%	3%	5%	47%	47%	20%	13%	

Table 31-1

QUESTION 28:

The last time I was stopped, ticketed, or arrested the police adequately explained the reason for their action.

BANNER 1

	SEX			AGE			RACE/ETHNICITY					EDUCATION			WARD						BORN IN US	
	TOTAL	M	F	18-39	40-59	60+	W	B/AA	H/L	API	MR/O	HS LESS	SOME COLL	COLL+	WARD 1	WARD 2	WARD 3	WARD 4	WARD 5	WARD 6	YES	NO
BASE=YES Q.23	100%	67%	33%	65%	24%	11%	31%	28%	31%	5%	5%	41%	38%	21%	9%	18%	17%	20%	9%	26%	92%	8%
**D/S (AGREE - DISAGREE)	35%	49%	8%	34%	48%	16%	64%	14%	37%	10%	-12%	86%	9%	-13%	-	43%	59%	-9%	33%	62%	42%	-44%
TOTAL AGREE	62%	70%	47%	63%	66%	51%	81%	50%	65%	31%	30%	90%	47%	35%	50%	68%	68%	39%	65%	76%	66%	17%
TOTAL DISAGREE	27%	20%	40%	29%	18%	35%	16%	35%	28%	21%	42%	5%	39%	48%	50%	24%	10%	47%	32%	14%	24%	61%
STRONGLY AGREE	33%	31%	35%	22%	57%	44%	63%	13%	24%	31%	10%	45%	25%	23%	24%	43%	19%	36%	16%	40%	34%	15%
SOMEWHAT AGREE	30%	38%	12%	41%	9%	7%	18%	36%	41%	-	20%	46%	22%	12%	26%	25%	49%	3%	49%	35%	32%	2%
SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	8%	4%	17%	11%	2%	5%	5%	3%	10%	-	42%	-	20%	2%	6%	-	-	32%	13%	-	8%	5%
STRONGLY DISAGREE	19%	17%	23%	18%	16%	30%	11%	32%	18%	21%	-	5%	19%	46%	44%	24%	10%	16%	19%	14%	16%	55%
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	11%	10%	13%	8%	16%	14%	3%	15%	7%	47%	28%	5%	14%	17%	-	8%	22%	14%	3%	10%	10%	22%

Table 32-1

QUESTION 29:

The last time I was stopped or arrested by the Aurora Police Department, the police treated me with respect.

BANNER 1

	SEX			AGE			RACE/ETHNICITY					EDUCATION			WARD						BORN IN US	
	TOTAL	M	F	18-39	40-59	60+	W	B/AA	H/L	API	MR/O	HS OR LESS	SOME COLL	COLL+	WARD 1	WARD 2	WARD 3	WARD 4	WARD 5	WARD 6	YES	NO
BASE=YES Q.23	100%	67%	33%	65%	24%	11%	31%	28%	31%	5%	5%	41%	38%	21%	9%	18%	17%	20%	9%	26%	92%	8%
**D/S (AGREE - DISAGREE)	17%	33%	-16%	9%	35%	23%	36%	17%	-3%	57%	-13%	47%	-1%	-9%	20%	1%	53%	6%	-52%	36%	18%	4%
TOTAL AGREE	49%	55%	36%	44%	59%	56%	67%	55%	26%	79%	20%	60%	39%	45%	45%	47%	68%	46%	22%	51%	51%	22%
TOTAL DISAGREE	32%	22%	53%	35%	24%	33%	32%	37%	29%	21%	32%	13%	41%	54%	25%	46%	15%	40%	75%	15%	33%	18%
STRONGLY AGREE	39%	44%	29%	35%	47%	50%	59%	41%	24%	47%	-	58%	22%	34%	19%	46%	60%	28%	6%	49%	42%	4%
SOMEWHAT AGREE	10%	11%	7%	9%	12%	6%	9%	14%	2%	31%	20%	2%	17%	11%	26%	1%	8%	18%	16%	2%	9%	19%
SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	13%	10%	21%	15%	7%	18%	19%	15%	10%	-	-	13%	15%	11%	-	20%	11%	12%	43%	5%	14%	-
STRONGLY DISAGREE	19%	12%	32%	20%	18%	15%	13%	22%	19%	21%	32%	-	26%	43%	25%	26%	4%	28%	32%	10%	19%	18%
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	19%	23%	11%	21%	16%	12%	1%	8%	45%	-	48%	27%	20%	1%	30%	7%	17%	14%	3%	34%	16%	59%

Table 33-1

QUESTION 30:

In the past year, have you had contact or interaction with Aurora Fire Rescue?

BANNER 1

	SEX			AGE			RACE/ETHNICITY					EDUCATION			WARD						BORN IN US	
	TOTAL	M	F	18-39	40-59	60+	W	B/AA	H/L	API	MR/O	HS LESS	SOME COLL	COLL+	WARD 1	WARD 2	WARD 3	WARD 4	WARD 5	WARD 6	YES	NO
BASE=TOTAL SAMPLE	100%	49%	51%	43%	33%	24%	46%	15%	27%	7%	5%	41%	31%	28%	10%	15%	19%	20%	17%	19%	90%	10%
**D/S (YES - NO)	-66%	-69%	-63%	-61%	-69%	-69%	-68%	-55%	-66%	-67%	-66%	-70%	-55%	-71%	-70%	-76%	-45%	-57%	-66%	-84%	-63%	-88%
YES	17%	16%	19%	20%	15%	15%	16%	22%	17%	16%	17%	15%	22%	14%	15%	12%	28%	21%	17%	8%	18%	6%
NO	83%	84%	81%	80%	85%	85%	84%	78%	83%	84%	83%	85%	78%	86%	85%	88%	72%	79%	83%	92%	82%	94%

Table 34-1
 QUESTION 31:
 How satisfied were you with the interaction?

BANNER 1

	SEX			AGE			RACE/ETHNICITY					EDUCATION			WARD						BORN IN US	
	TOTAL	M	F	18-39	40-59	60+	W	B/AA	H/L	API	MR/O	HS OR LESS	SOME COLL	COLL+	WARD 1	WARD 2	WARD 3	WARD 4	WARD 5	WARD 6	YES	NO
BASE=YES Q.30	100%	44%	56%	49%	29%	22%	43%	19%	26%	7%	5%	36%	41%	23%	9%	11%	30%	25%	16%	9%	96%	4%
**D/S (SATISFIED - DISSATISFIED)	67%	85%	53%	50%	76%	95%	82%	82%	42%	60%	25%	41%	86%	76%	57%	98%	35%	78%	86%	88%	67%	88%
TOTAL SATISFIED	79%	88%	73%	70%	83%	95%	86%	88%	71%	60%	61%	65%	90%	81%	75%	98%	64%	79%	91%	92%	79%	91%
TOTAL DISSATISFIED	12%	2%	20%	20%	8%	-	3%	6%	29%	-	36%	25%	4%	6%	18%	-	30%	1%	5%	4%	12%	3%
VERY SATISFIED	63%	69%	59%	56%	63%	81%	70%	82%	48%	39%	53%	60%	69%	57%	54%	69%	61%	49%	84%	77%	63%	69%
SOMEWHAT SATISFIED	16%	19%	13%	14%	20%	15%	16%	6%	23%	21%	8%	5%	21%	24%	22%	29%	4%	30%	7%	15%	16%	22%
SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED	10%	1%	17%	18%	3%	-	1%	2%	29%	-	24%	25%	1%	2%	14%	-	25%	-	3%	4%	10%	3%
VERY DISSATISFIED	2%	2%	3%	2%	5%	-	2%	4%	-	-	11%	-	4%	4%	4%	-	4%	1%	2%	-	2%	-
NEITHER SATISFIED NOR DISSATISFIED	9%	10%	8%	11%	9%	4%	11%	6%	-	40%	3%	10%	5%	13%	7%	2%	6%	21%	4%	4%	9%	6%

Table 35-1
 QUESTION 32:
 As you may know, a consent decree has been imposed on the Aurora Police Department and Aurora Fire Rescue mandating certain reforms. How much have you seen, read, or heard about this?

BANNER 1

	SEX			AGE			RACE/ETHNICITY					EDUCATION			WARD						BORN IN US	
	TOTAL	M	F	18-39	40-59	60+	W	B/AA	H/L	API	MR/O	HS OR LESS	SOME COLL	COLL+	WARD 1	WARD 2	WARD 3	WARD 4	WARD 5	WARD 6	YES	NO
BASE=TOTAL SAMPLE	100%	49%	51%	43%	33%	24%	46%	15%	27%	7%	5%	41%	31%	28%	10%	15%	19%	20%	17%	19%	90%	10%
**D/S (A LOT/SOME - NOT MUCH/NOTHING)	-27%	-29%	-25%	-32%	-27%	-18%	-26%	-32%	-30%	-37%	1%	-15%	-40%	-31%	-45%	-30%	-26%	-25%	-25%	-20%	-29%	-11%
TOTAL A LOT/SOME	36%	36%	37%	34%	36%	41%	37%	34%	35%	32%	51%	43%	30%	35%	27%	35%	37%	38%	37%	40%	36%	45%
TOTAL NOT MUCH/NOTHING	64%	64%	63%	66%	64%	59%	63%	66%	65%	68%	49%	57%	70%	65%	73%	65%	63%	62%	63%	60%	64%	55%
A LOT	13%	12%	13%	13%	12%	12%	12%	22%	7%	10%	28%	16%	9%	12%	13%	12%	11%	17%	16%	8%	13%	10%
SOME	24%	24%	24%	20%	24%	29%	25%	13%	28%	21%	23%	27%	21%	23%	15%	23%	26%	20%	21%	33%	22%	35%
NOT TOO MUCH	24%	23%	25%	22%	24%	27%	24%	27%	26%	21%	15%	18%	27%	30%	35%	30%	26%	25%	17%	18%	24%	28%
NOTHING AT ALL	39%	41%	38%	44%	39%	31%	39%	38%	39%	47%	34%	40%	43%	35%	38%	35%	37%	38%	46%	42%	41%	28%