| Incident Date | Incident Number | Incident Location | Operator Error Category | Incident Details | Regional Assigned Ticket # | Response from Broward County Regional Communications |
|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|
| 5/16/2016 | 34-1605-073796 | 48xx N Federal Hwy | Unit Assignment | An in progress armed robbery that was entered as a suspicious incident; The call was never alert toned | Trende ii | |
| 4/15/2016 | 34-1604-056830 | sr7 | Interposition Communications | Officer was OJ when he encountered a traffic crash. Officer was switched channel to channel while trying to report and gets updates to/from department of jurisdiction. | 411502 | The unit did not transmit the accident OJ on District 1. The District 1 dispactcher created a call for Fort Lauderdale Police Department as an on-view for the unit, however, she did not generate a call for CKPD. The unit did switch to DLE HQ and proceeded to have the request made there. The dispatcher, however, could have generated this call for CK without the switching talkgroups. We will review this with the operator invovled and with all staff. |
| 5/25/2015 | 34-1505-083188 | 29xx Ocean Blvd | Event Classification | The call was not dispatched with the information consistent with the information that was given by the call taker on the 911 tape. | | |
| 5/4/2016 | 34-1605-067047 | 10xx NW 25 Ave | Event Management | Complainant has been having ongoing noise issues with his neighbor. He complained that we never responded to his latest call. Reviewing the CFS, module shows the call was cancelled by complainant. He is insistent that he did not cancell the call. | | |
| 4/16/2016 | 34-1604-055861 | NW 14th Ave @ NW 6 St | Unit Assignment | Dist. 2 was engaged in a foot chase of a suspect from a stolen vehicle. The chase was heading towards the boarder of another district. A Sgt. and Capt monitoring Dist 2 came over the air and advised dispatch to alert tone the call over the other channels. An alert tone was not heard by either requesting supervisor and they feel there was ample time to do so. | 407608 | We find error as outlined in the concern. The QA unit will be reviewing all components of this event. |
| 4/28/2016 | 34-1604-061199 | 6xx NW 19 Ave | Event Classification | Call for a shooting at Lincoln Park. The call was not dispatched on all channels, only on District 2. | | |
| 4/22/2016 | 34-1604-060268 | 25xx NW 20 | Verbal Communication | Ofc. Responded to the incident location to what sounded like a burglary in progress at 2127 hours. A perimeter was set. Prior to arrival, the Ofc. Requested information to verify and clarify if the victim was home (occupied 21?). The dispatcher repeated the call the victim was watching the suspect attempt to gain entry into his home. The dispatcher sent the request to the call taker. The Ofc. never received any further information. The victim stated he notifed the call taker that he was at home wastching the subject actively trying to gain entry into his house. The information was never provided to the Ofc. | | |
| 4/12/2016 | 34-1604-055250 | 5700 block North Federal Hwy | Addressing | Officer requested dispatch to have another Officer respond and dispatch was sending him to the 2700 block of N. Fed Hwy. Dispatch was unaware of the Ofc's location after he had advised of the traffic stop over the Police radio and had told them previously he was going to be at 2121 NE 53rd St. They were requesting an Officer from the south sector to respond when the Officer was at the North sector. | 406463 | In this case, the dispatcher never lost the unit's location and had the location updates documented timely in CAD. The only error made was requesting a South unit instead of a North unit. The dispatcher did not have any issues with tracking the unit's location. The issue with her asking for a South unit instead of a North unit may have been a mis-speak by the dispatcher and could have caused the unit to believe that she did not have a correct location, however, this was not the case. This event will still be evaluated and reviewed with the dispatcher by the Quality Assurance team. |
| 3/16/2016 | 34-1603-038657 | 40xx Galt Ocean Drive | Event Classification | Officers were dispatched to back up the fire department on a medical call regarding a person suspected of being on FLAKKA. Fire alleges that they requested PD Code 3 on three occasions. Officer states he was not advised about the Code 3 request until he read about it in the CAD notes in inquired. | 398731 | This matter is unfounded in that FR did not request Code 3 multiple times. A Code 3 reponse was requested only once, and was immediately confirmed to DLE when they saw this update. FR had made contact with the patient prior to unit's arrival, and had asked for an ETA, but never elevated the response until just prior to DLE being requested to respond in this manner. |
| 2/29/2016 | 34-1602-031853 | Originated in Lighthouse Point | Interposition Communications | On 02/29/16, the Dispatcher advised that Lighthouse Point Police Department was in pursuit of a stolen vehicle that was involved in several burglaries and that it was southbound on I-95 at SW 10th Street. Supervisor Cedric Hugley came on the District 2 channel and was giving us updates. The updates were delayed and it was not real time intelligence. The radios were asked to be patched with Lighthouse Point Police Department and was advised that it could not be done. The following jurisdictions were involved in assisting Lighthouse Point Police: Broward Sheriff Office (Oakland Park, Lauderdale Lakes and Aviation Unit), Lauderhill Police Department, Florida Highway Patrol, and Fort Lauderdale Police Department. All agencies appeared to be operating on their own assigned radio channel and the real time intelligence was being disseminated as delayed. Detective Jared Gross located the second stolen vehicle and advised that he was in pursuit on District 2 channel and the other jurisdictions were not aware as they did not have our communication as real time intelligence. The communication that was being passed along amongst all jurisdictions were communicated in person out in the field with the other agency such as apprehending two suspects from the second stolen vehicle bailout. Officer Travis Weston responded to the first bailout location in the 3800 Block NW 19th Street (Lauderdale Lakes jurisdiction) and requested several times for BSO Lauderdale Lakes to respond and it took several minutes before anyone showed up. I believe that the teamwork would have been much better if all communication was limited to one channel to avoid any confusion and gather real time intelligence as it was happening. | 397943 | There is no policy on this, per se, However, this is an established practice. Again, this falls to the Duty Officer for coordination and patching. This is being identified as an "Operator" issue, in that the event occurred due to the operator (Duty Officer) not establishing a primary point of control and management. This issue will be addressed with ALL Duty Officers at all sites reitering this expectation and procedure for implementation. |

| Incident Date | Incident Number | Incident Location | Operator Error Category | Incident Details | Regional Assigned Ticket # | Response from Broward County Regional Communications |
|------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|---|
| 2/26/2016 | 34-1602-030151 | 6xx NE 5th Ave | Interposition Communications | The particular dispatcher that was broadcasting has a tone/speech pattern that is often difficult to understand via police radio. This particular dispatcher has become well known as difficult to understand, so much so, that when his voice is initially heard officers talk about how difficult the evening will be. On this incident in particular there are two issues that we would like addressed. 1) Both the responding officers and supervisor were unable to understand the information being dispatched on the first transmission (and subsequent) 2) The site manager was unwilling switch out the dispatcher to help meet the operational needs of the district. | 396083 | The audio was reviewed. The dispatcher provided all call details and responded to all units appropriately. This is a veteran, decorated dispatcher who has been recognized in the past for exemplary performance. His speech patterns are not unintelligible and removing a dispatcher from working an assignment in which he is trained is not a viable option. |
| 3/2/2016 | 34-1602-025238 | 64xx NE 18th Ave | Radio Management | Officer was sent to an in progress domestic violence call along with a back-up who had to XY from another sector. After arriving on scene of the in progress domestic violence the dispatcher began to read, in great detail, a long list of holding calls thus shutting down the officer's conduit of communication. | | This call was entered at 1827:36 hours. The dispatcher alerted the call to all channels and then confirmed the Sgt was aware of 1829:40 hours. The Sgt took the call and a back up was assigned. The Sgt was asked if he could copy on "2". The first unit responding to this call then arrived, and the Sgt told the dispatcher to "go ahead." The dispatcher proceeded to read calls pending. IN this case, the dispatcher attempted to give the Sgt pending calls as required by SOP. However, once the first unit arrived on a priority call, all radio traffic needed to stop and the air held for the unit's declaration of the status of the call. The dispatcher was adhering to one policy when he violated another. SOP 2.6.1H directs that all units arrival to a priority call must have the air held automatically. That did not occur. This issue will be documented and the operator will have this policy outlined clearly for remedial purposes. |
| Multiple | Multiple | Multiple | Radio Management | It has been noticed lately that when checking an alarm and coming across an opened door, some dispatchers are alert toning the fact that there is open door/window or alert toning when asked to hold the air while checking an alarm or for any other reason. This can pose an officer safety issue for needed air time or by a loud alert tone giving away the element of surprise of an officer who is outside an open door of a home where a potential subject may be. Can we please have this eliminated so that alert tones are not done to notify people to not use the air. | 396777 | There are no incidents to review, so this is ticket will be responding to policy and practice SOP 2.2F. This policy outlines the use of the different tone alert requirements. To suspend the use of any alerts would be a matter for ORT as it would have county-wide implications. |
| Multiple | Multiple | Multiple | Event Classification | Being a narcotics canine I am requested several times during a shift. Having an in car radio I am able to scan the other districts and I have noticed on some instances that someone from another district will ask for a narcotics canine and if I am on a call, a traffic stop, or assigned to a call, the dispatcher will simply respond that I am busy instead of going all channels. This poses several issues for both requests and legal reasons. We have a time limit to respond to calls for requests which is 15 minutes. If I am unaware of a request, I cannot respond within the time frame of the traffic stop. Also, I have been writing calls off completing paper able to respond and I am never notified. Can we please address this so that all requests go all channels at the time of request | | The second component is a concern regarding the availability of narcotic canines when the unit is not available for call assignment. In these cases, any specialized unit is required to still be notified of a request and the unit will make a determination of when or if they can respond. A dispatcher should not be advising a unit making a request for a specialized unit that the unit is not available unless that is what the unit themselves have communicated. We can address this with all staff. |
| | 34-1602-020154 155, 156, 157, 158 | 1048 NE 3 Ave | Event Creation/Updates | Multiple missing person calls were received. Initially Ofc. Shields volunteered to handle. She then responded to an in progress call and advised dispatch to remove her from the calls. The calls were never put back into the queue, and subsequently appear to have been closed out by dispatch. As a result missing children were never entered into FCIC/NCIC. This was discovered when a call was placed to recover the children this morning, and they were not in the system. | 392247 | After a discussion between the Site Manager and this employee, the employee has confirmed that she intentionally closed all calls in pending because it was "common practice" at FLPD that when a unit stated that they would handle precisely these types of calls, the unit was responsible for all follow up and that it was acceptable for the dispatcher to code them out without further dialogue. However, at 0507:35, 34A43 was cleared from the cases, and was enroute to an unrelated S10. All calls were returned to pending queue. |
| 2/22/2016 | 34-1602-027642 | N/A | Event Creation/Updates | Officers were on a scene with a fleeing subject who allegedly had a warrant. An officer ran the subject on Teletype and he came back with a hit for a felony warrant. The officer attempted to get the operator to confirm the warrant, but the operator refused because the officer did not have the subject in custody (he was fleeing). We were awaiting the information so that we could deploy K9 who was on scene. The operator should have advised the officer that a status check could be completed, at very minimum, as opposed to refusing to confirm. Please look into and advise of findings. | 395699 | The TTY operator asked if the subject was in custody, and the unit said "no". The unit stated that she was chasing the subject and "trying to figure this out." The TTY operator stated that she cannot confirm on a warrant in which the subject was not in custody. The TTY operator's direction is correct. There is a long standing procedure that only subjects who are detained or in custody will be confirmed for anything in the system. In this case, the TTY operator absolutely advised the unit that the subject had a possible warrant for felony narcotics. She was just not able to confirm if the warrant was still active unless the subject was detained or in custody. There is no violation of policy in this case. |
| 2/20/2016 | 34-1602-026891 | 43xx N Ft Lauderdale Bch Blvd | Addressing | Officers were dispatched to a woman screaming for help. Upon officers arrival to the area they discovered that the numerical address did not exist and no one matching the description of the person in need could be found. Further investigation revealed that the call was in a city other than Fort Lauderdale. | 395701 | The caller's LAT/LONG showed that he would have been north of Commercial on Ocean Blvd, which would have been a numerically higher number than what he offered at 4301. Based upon this, the caller did provide an incorrect address. The location provided could not have been 4301 based upon his LAT/LONG coordinates. In using 4301, only FL is valid for a city of choice, LBTS is not. What is most confusing is that the caller stated that units were on scene prior to disconnecting. There are no calls found for LBTS in this timeframe, so it is unsure if a unit happened upon the scene or would have been from another agency. |

| Incident Date | Incident Number | Incident Location | Operator Error Category | Incident Details | Regional Assigned Ticket # | Response from Broward County Regional Communications |
|------------------|-----------------|------------------------|----------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--|
| 2/19/2016 | 34-1602-026300 | 32xx N Fed Hwy | Addressing | Officers were dispatched to a report of a person attempting to commit suicide with a knife. Officers were lead to believe that the caller was with the suicidal subject. Officers circulated the area looking for the subject without success. After officers cleared the area and closed out the call they were advised that they drove past the suspect and needed to return. This is when the officers learned that the caller was not on the scene and was calling from an office miles away. | | |
| 2/22/2016 | 34-1602-027900 | Riverland RD & SR 7 | Event Classification | How does the narrative of this call justify it being classified as a S-37 and not a S-41/S-0 just occurred? | 394443 | The call dials 911 and reports that an altercation involving teenagers – one of which is walking with a long knife "type thing". A description is given to the operator, and the caller comments that a cell phone was stolen and someone is now being chased. The caller repeats that a type of weapon is seen. The operator's comments reflect the issue reported, however, the signal absolutely fails to capture the incident as described. SOP oulines clearlyt that an operator will use the highest classification when confronted with an event that could be considered more than one type of event. In this case, the caller is clearly describing a robbery type event in which the subject was armed. There should not have been any confusion as to what the signal should have been. |
| N/A | N/A | Maguire's | Event Creation/Updates | Two car break ins at Maguire's tonight. Response time for PD over two hours. Also, dispatch talked one car owners who appeared not to have anythind stolen to not file a report. | 393375 | There is no evidence at all that this incident occurred with any member of Regional Comm. The caller called into Regional Communications 3 times. There were no outgoing calls made to the caller from either of our dispatch/call taker positions. No audio was found that would suggest that any of our call takers/dispatchers advised or insinuated that the caller should not file a police report. If it is possible, please have the complainant provide a phone number that called the caller or the phone number the caller dialed when he was allegedly advised to not file a report. The call was holding at the discretion of the 34D15. Dispatch notified/attempted to notify 34D15 of the call 4 times. |
| 2/10/2016 | 34-1602-021508 | 43xx N Fed Hwy | Unit Assignment | An vehicle accident came in through the call center at 2056. At this time a PSA (34Z17) had been in service for 2 hours and was not dispatched to this call, causing the call to hold and driver to wait longer than needed. | 392482 | Occurred as outlined. 34Z17 was available from the previous assignment at 1904 hours. This event was generated at 2056 hours. There is no reason why this call was not assigned at the Z unit as required. |
| 1/22/2016 | 34-0122-011558 | 24xx S Fed Hwy | Event Creation/Updates | When this call was dispatched, the dispatcher advised of the culprits running to a Uhaul, not understanding if it was a business or truck. It was unclear so Ofc. Scola pulled up the call. After seeing that the Burglary was to the Mercedes dealership, Ofc. Scola only had to read to line 4, to read a fantastic BOLO of the culprit vehicle. Uhaul Sprinter Van, tag AG80157. Sprinter vans are extremely recognizable, and the tag was a bonus. Dispatch failed to broadcast this vital information, so Ofc. Scola did. And when she did, Officer Walters was in eye shot of the Sprinter Van! The van only had about a mile before hitting I-95, and could've potentially gotten away. Only to come back later and steal expensive Mercedes' to further the victimization of a Ft Lauderdale business. This ended well with all 6 in custody, but it could've easily been worse. | 391306 | In this event, the dispatcher provided all of the information that was in the CAD entry with the exception of stating that it was a "sprinter van" and the tag number. She did mention that subjects were GOA in a Uhaul on more than one occasion. This omission should have been spoken as it was on the CAD entry upon unit assignment. |
| 1/23/2016 | 34-1601-011581 | 6xx NE 4 Ave | Unit Assignment | A subject opened Reportee's bedroom window and fled. This call may have had a 15 minute time delay but it was held for an additional 7 minutes. While this call was holding, Sgt. Fortunato was sitting directly across from the address, unaware that the call was pending because dispatch never dispatched it. The air was being held at that time for an alarm, but this constitutes an alert tone and breaking 10-33. This was a great officer safety issue, the burglary subject could have run up on Sgt. Fortunato with him completely unaware the culprit had just committed a burglary. | 391304 | This delay in unit assignment is unacceptable. The air was initially held appropriately for the 49A. SOP directs that the air can be held for a 3 minute interval for incidents such as what occurred in this case. However, the air was cleared within 2 minutes. Therefore, all subsevential traffic should have been managed in accordance with policy. SOP outlines that priority 4 events have a 3 minute window for assignment. This call was not assigned until 7 minutes after initiation. Further, this call was a more urgent matter than the 22N complaint, and should have taken higher precedence than routine traffic and the assignment of the disturbance call. The delay in managing this event is inexcusable. |
| 5/30/2015 | 34-1506-091798 | BGH | Event Interrogation | Today I responded to Walgreens at 1515 E Sunrise Blvd in ref. to a shoplifting in progress. The call stated that the manager was not comfortable making contact with two young adult males and he called police. The call taker took the information at hand and told the reportee "we'll send someone" and hung up. My question is, is there not a policy to keep someone on the phone during an in progress call, even if it's a misdemeanor? By the time I got to the Walgreens coming from the north the subjects were gone in a vehicle and probably drove right by me. I asked the manager Eric Pearson why he didn't stay on the phone and he said he was not given that option. He advised of a similar incident last week where he watched the suspect go to the Publix parking lot, but the call taker did not stay on the phone with him. It would be helpful, at least when the call is still in progress if contact was maintained. | N/A | The County has investigated your complaint and has determined that policy was violated in the described incident. The BSO employee will be addressed and referred for remedial training. |

| Incident Date | Incident Number | Incident Location | Operator Error Category | Incident Details | Regional Assigned Ticket # | Response from Broward County Regional Communications |
|------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|---|----------------------------------|--|
| 6/12/2015 | 34-1506-092946 | 7xx E Evanston Cir | Unit Assignment | The call was received at 1355hrs advising of a s-0 subject chasing his sister. Several units from bravo shift handled the call. A charlie shift unit 34C62 did a prisoner transport for the incident to JAC. At some point around 1756 the call was re-dispatched as in progress with units going code 3. The incident was not going on. The aggressor was not on scene and the female at the home said no one called that the incident was solved earlier in the day by police response. | | |
| 6/25/2015 | 34-1506-010082 | 17xx W Las Olas Blvd | Verbalizing Event Detail | The problem presented with this call was that we were never advised by dispatch while enroute (information acquired after arrival from the victim, who later advised that she had notified the communication center at the commencement of the original call) that the house was occupied during the burglary which would have elicited a different response from the responding officers to ensure the safety of the occupant. Please review so that we may avoid in the future. | | |