

OFFICE OF POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW

CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

OPCR-21-15



PUBLISH DATE: March 1, 2022

FROM: Office of Police Conduct Review

CASE SUMMARY NUMBER: OPCR-21-15

ALLEGATIONS

	Policy Implicated	MPD Policy Manual Range	OPCR Outcome	PCRPFinding	MPD Outcome
Ofc. 1 Allegation 1	4-410 City Vehicles & On-Duty Accidents	A-D	Referred to Coaching	N/A	Coached
Ofc. 2 Allegation 2	4-223 (IV)(A)(6)(d)(i) Body Worn Cameras	A-D	Referred to Coaching	N/A	Not Coached
Ofc. 2 Allegation 1	4-223 (IV)(A)(6)(d)(i) Body Worn Cameras	A-D	Referred to Coaching	N/A	Not Coached
Ofc. 2 Allegation 2	4-401.02 Seat Belts	A-D	Referred to Coaching	N/A	Coached

REPORTED DEMOGRAPHICS

Race: N/A

Gender: N/A

Police Precinct: 3rd

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT

An officer was driving a marked MPD squad southbound on Cedar Ave. A mini-van in front of the squad slammed on the brakes to avoid hitting the car in front of them that had stopped abruptly. A chain reaction occurred, and the squad rear ended the mini-van causing the mini-van to strike the car in front of it. No airbags were deployed in any of the involved vehicles. Officers reported their speed to be less than 25 mph. Medical was dispatched to the scene and none of the involved were transported. All vehicles were driven away from the crash.

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION

1) INTAKE INVESTIGATION

a) VisiNet report

- i) The “Problem” is listed as “Property Damage Accident”. The call log indicates a supervisor was dispatched to the scene at the time the incident occurred and responded in accordance with policy.

b) Police Report

- i) Public Section of the report states:

“Officers were leaving a call and then got involved in a Squad Accident. EMS evaluated all involved. Blue cards were given to the drivers. All involved drove away. Supervisors arrived on the scene. BWC.”

c) Other

- i) Minnesota DPS Motor Vehicle Crash Report
- ii) MPD Accident Review Committee Report

(1) Committee found the accident was preventable

2) VIDEO ANALYST REVIEW

a) Body Worn Camera (BWC) Review

- i) BWC was not active during the crash. Officers had just cleared a call and had deactivated their cameras following that incident. BWCs are reactivated following the crash before officers begin gathering information from the others involved.

b) Squad Video Review

- i) Squad video does not exist for this incident. Squad video can be manually activated or is automatically activated when other emergency equipment (lights/sirens) is activated. In this incident, the squad was being operated in “normal” conditions defined by policy and therefore was not active at the time of the collision.

3) CASE REVIEW & JOINT SUPERVISOR ROUTING

- a) After reviewing the relevant and available evidence collected during intake, the Joint Supervisors agreed the complaint should be referred to the precinct for coaching.

CASE OUTCOME

4) *OFFICE OF POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW*

- a) The matter was referred to 3rd Precinct supervisors for coaching.

5) *MINNEAPOLIS POLICE DEPARTMENT*

- a) Supervisors in the 3rd Precinct returned coaching documents that showed the following:

Officer 1 Allegation 1: coaching was completed as the accident was deemed preventable.

Officer 1 Allegation 2: coaching was not completed as the supervisor deemed the officer was following the BWC policy.

Officer 2 Allegation 1: coaching was not completed as the supervisor deemed the officer was following the BWC policy.

Officer 2 Allegation 2: coaching was completed as the officer was not wearing their seat belt at the time of the crash.