



Office of the Police Oversight Monitor

Review Scope & Purpose

The Office of the Police Oversight Monitor (OPOM), in partnership with the Special Investigations Unit (SIU), conducted a department-wide review of 96 vehicle pursuits that occurred between April and September 2024. Each pursuit was evaluated using a standardized rubric to assess compliance with policy, the quality of supervisory engagement, and pursuit-related outcomes. This review was not discipline-focused. Rather, it aimed to identify systemic trends, recurring gaps, and opportunities to strengthen pursuit-related decision-making, risk management, and internal review processes. The ultimate goal is to support public safety and officer performance through data-informed policy and practice improvements.

General Orders & Violations Identified

Across 96 pursuits, 291 policy violations were identified. The most frequently violated General Orders included:

- 305.03 N – Reporting (81 violations)
- 305.03 F – Pursuit Operation (79)
- 506.03 D(1)(b)(2) – BWC Requirements (36)
- 305.03 D – Restrictions on Vehicle Pursuits (21)

Additional violations were related to initiation, prohibited tactics, and supervisory responsibilities.

Pursuit Reasons

Of the 96 pursuits reviewed, the most commonly recorded reasons for initiation were:

- Felony – 39
- FLOCK–Stolen Vehicle Alert – 31
- Danger to Motorist – 20
- Other– 8
- Violent Misdemeanor – 3
- Not Authorized Per General Order – 3
- Felony Warrant – 3

Notably, in over one-third of cases labeled “on-view felony,” the reason for initiation was inaccurate. In those instances, on-view felonies were the provided reason for the pursuit; however, felony charges were not identified until after the pursuit had already been initiated.

Key Statistical Findings

- Total Pursuits Reviewed: 96
- Pursuits with Violations: 80 (83%)

- Pursuits Without Violations: 16 (17%)
- Total Policy Violations: 291
- Supervisor Authorization: 61 pursuits were improperly authorized, 10 had no recorded decision
- Most Active Divisions: Specialized Units (DRU - 23), followed by South (19), East (18), and West (15)

Injury & Accident Summary

- Accidents Involved: 45 pursuits (47%)
- Injuries to Officers: 1
- Injuries to Suspects: 3
- Injuries to Others: 0

Pursuit Speeds

- Average Pursuit Speed: 90.65 mph
- Maximum Speed: 135 mph
- 25th Percentile: 79.5 mph
- Median (50th Percentile): 93 mph
- 75th Percentile: 106.4 mph
- 46% of pursuits exceeded 100 mph

Discipline & Accountability

- Discipline Matrix Compliance: Only 21 cases aligned; 38 were misaligned
- Use of Mitigating Factors: 24 cases were downgraded against policy thresholds
- Corrective Training: Only 8 cases involved any form of structured training
- Chain of Command Actions:
 - 50 officers received verbal/informal counseling
 - 27 cases with no recorded action
 - Only 7 resulted in formal or progressive discipline

Recommendations to Fort Worth Police Department

Based on these findings, OPOM offers the following recommendations to strengthen the Fort Worth Police Department's pursuit policies and practices:

1. Refine Pursuit Authorization Protocols

Establish clear criteria for supervisor approval to reduce ambiguity and ensure consistent decision-making across all divisions. The current pattern where 74% of pursuits lack proper supervisory authorization represents a systematic breakdown in command structure during critical moments.

While General Order 305.03 G provides clear direction that supervisors must announce their authorization decisions over the radio, the data indicates this is not happening consistently in practice. This does not necessarily reflect individual supervisors failing to perform their duties; rather, it points to procedural gaps that may be making compliance more difficult than it should be.

OPOM recommends considering a default termination approach where pursuits automatically end after 60 seconds without explicit supervisor authorization broadcast over radio. This shifts focus from trying to catch problems after they happen to preventing them from developing in the first place. While this represents a significant change from current practice, it ensures that every pursuit receives the supervisory oversight the policy intends.

Additionally, the department should establish backup authorization protocols for situations where primary supervisors are unavailable, as these gaps currently contribute to unauthorized pursuit continuation.

2. Strengthen Supervisor Accountability

Hold supervisors accountable for appropriate authorization decisions, timely documentation, and proactive intervention when circumstances warrant. The data indicates that supervisor accountability encompasses more than individual decision-making—it reflects broader challenges in how consequences are applied consistently across the organization. When 50 officers receive only verbal counseling and 27 cases show no recorded action despite documented policy violations, this may inadvertently create an environment where violations become predictable rather than exceptional, according to an International Association of Chiefs of Police resolution on pursuit policy that emphasizes effective pursuit policies must include comprehensive supervisory oversight elements and mandatory training for all agency members.

These supervisory oversight deficiencies are exemplified in [REDACTED], which had significant issues around supervisor oversight, including the fact that 24 FWPD officers were allowed to self-dispatch via CAD. Additionally, the high pursuit frequency of Officer [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]—with 19 and 15 pursuits, respectively—further highlights deficiencies in supervisory monitoring and intervention of repeat violators.

The department should hold supervisors to the same standards they are asked to enforce. When a supervisor improperly authorizes a pursuit or fails to document their decision, they should face the same disciplinary framework as officers who violate pursuit protocols. OPOM also recommends requiring supervisors to complete post-pursuit debriefings within 24 hours of any pursuit occurring under their supervision, regardless of outcome. These debriefings would help identify decision points, assess policy compliance, and capture lessons learned that could strengthen future training. This approach treats debriefings as learning opportunities rather than fault-finding exercises.



3. Align Disciplinary Actions with Policy Standards

Ensure consistent enforcement of minimum disciplinary standards outlined in the matrix, regardless of mitigating factors. The practice of downgrading 24 cases against established policy thresholds using mitigating factors undermines what the disciplinary framework is designed to accomplish. While circumstances can vary and flexibility has its place, when mitigating factors become routine, they signal that policy requirements are more like guidelines than actual standards—particularly concerning when these violations directly impact officer and community safety.

This concern is evident in [REDACTED], where East Division officers were disciplined for policy violations, while West Division officers involved in the same pursuit—receiving the same infractions—were not. Instead, South Command addressed the issue with a roll call discussion. Inconsistent disciplinary outcomes like this raise concerns about fairness and reinforce the perception that accountability is applied unevenly across commands.

OPOM recommends that mitigating factors be reserved for truly extraordinary circumstances, such as genuine life-threatening emergencies or equipment failures beyond an officer's control. Administrative considerations like workload, experience level, or previous good performance, while important, are not appropriate justifications for violations that create safety risks. When mitigating factors are applied, the department should require written justification approved by a Deputy Chief or higher, along with annual reporting to identify patterns that indicate systemic policy challenges rather than individual officer issues.

4. Expand Pursuit-Specific Training and Development

Provide recurring, scenario-based training to reinforce pursuit-related policy, risk assessment, and field decision-making. Ongoing training should reflect operational realities and support continued professional development. The finding that only 8 cases involved structured training despite 291 total violations indicates the department is missing valuable opportunities to address performance gaps through education rather than relying primarily on corrective action. The current approach appears more reactive than proactive, focusing on addressing problems after they occur rather than preventing them from developing. The Police Executive Research Forum and COPS Office training framework emphasizes that vehicular pursuits rank among the most hazardous and controversial activities undertaken by law enforcement and recommends providing law enforcement leaders with concrete steps they can take to review, manage, and implement effective pursuit policies.

The department should develop training programs that incorporate the specific scenarios appearing in the violation data—for instance, the proper classification of "on-view felonies," where the review found one-third were inaccurate. Scenario-based training could help officers practice real-time decision-making under the kind of pressure they actually face in the field. Additionally, supervisors would benefit from specialized training on real-time pursuit management, including guidance on when and how to intervene during active situations. This training should position supervisors as



tactical advisors and supportive resources rather than simply policy enforcers, helping officers navigate complex decisions while maintaining necessary safety standards.

5. Leverage Technology for Review Accuracy

Integrate AVL, speed, and video data into all post-pursuit reviews to enhance objectivity and identify procedural gaps. While the department's AVL systems capture speed and location data, there appears to be a gap between data collection capabilities and real-time operational support for supervisors during active pursuits.

OPOM recommends exploring automated alert systems that could notify supervisors when pursuits exceed predetermined risk thresholds—such as specific speed limits, duration beyond predetermined timeframes, or entry into high-density areas like school zones or hospital districts. These types of capabilities are available through multiple CAD vendors that offer integrated AVL systems with customizable alert thresholds and real-time situational awareness features. A separate technology assessment will determine the current system's capabilities and implementation requirements for such enhancements.

Additionally, OPOM identified that several vehicles involved in pursuits either lacked in-car cameras (ICCs) or had non-functional units at the time of the incident. This gap compromises the completeness of post-pursuit reviews and limits the integration of video evidence into accountability processes. OPOM recommends conducting a department-wide audit of the current fleet to verify ICC installation and operational functionality.

Modern CAD and AVL technologies can potentially provide automated alerts based on predefined criteria, real-time vehicle information including location and speed data, geofencing capabilities for sensitive areas, and integration with external data sources for comprehensive situational awareness. The goal would be to support supervisory decision-making rather than replace it, providing objective information to inform authorization and termination decisions during active pursuits.

Any technological solutions should include redundancy and backup systems to ensure reliability during critical incidents. A comprehensive technology assessment, request forthcoming, will help determine which capabilities can be implemented within the department's current infrastructure and identify areas requiring system upgrades or vendor changes.

6. Implement Early Intervention for Repeat Violations

Develop systems to flag officers with multiple pursuit-related violations and ensure timely follow-up, including coaching, review, or training, to reduce repeat incidents. The absence of systematic early intervention represents a missed opportunity to address performance concerns before they develop into serious safety issues or require disciplinary action. Pattern recognition should extend beyond

individual officers to include analysis of shift-based trends, geographic hotspots, and seasonal variations that indicate broader challenges rather than isolated individual issues.

Early intervention should be supportive and development-focused rather than punitive. Officers with multiple violations would benefit from individualized coaching that addresses the specific circumstances of their situations rather than generic policy review. This could include ride-alongs with experienced supervisors, simulation training for high-stress decision-making, or mentorship programs with officers who consistently demonstrate excellent pursuit decision-making. The goal should be performance improvement and risk reduction rather than punishment, fostering a culture where officers feel comfortable seeking guidance before challenges develop rather than after problems occur.

7. Establish Departmental Speed Thresholds Within Texas Law Framework

While Texas Transportation Code Section 546.001 provides emergency vehicles broad authority to "exceed maximum speed limits...as long as the operator does not endanger life or property," the department has both the opportunity and responsibility to establish more specific speed governance that better protects officer and public safety. The current approach has resulted in 46% of pursuits exceeding 100 mph with an average speed of 90.65 mph, creating unnecessary risk exposure for everyone involved. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration reports that police pursuit-related fatal crashes reached 455 in 2020, the highest since 2007, underscoring the critical need for speed governance that balances law enforcement objectives with public safety.

OPOM recommends that the Fort Worth Police Department establish a three-tiered speed intervention system that operates within Texas legal authority while supplementing existing supervisory authorization protocols. Implementation would depend on the department's current technological capabilities:

Option 1: Manual Implementation (if automated notification technology is unavailable)

- Tier 1 (Moderate Speed Threshold - for example, 85 mph): Officers must notify the designated supervisor via radio when reaching predetermined speed, requiring supervisor acknowledgment and tactical assessment before continuation.
 - *Real-life application: Officer radios "[Supervisor Identifying Info], reaching 85 mph on I-20 at Rosedale, request acknowledgment for continuation." Supervisor reviews conditions and responds "Acknowledged, continue" or "Reduce speed and reassess."*
- Tier 2 (High Speed Threshold - for example, 100 mph): Officers must request explicit supervisor authorization via radio, with supervisor making active continuation decision based on evolving circumstances.
 - *Real-life application: Officer radios "[Supervisor Identifying Info], requesting authorization to continue pursuit at 100 mph." Supervisor evaluates current risk factors and responds "Authorized to continue" or "Terminate pursuit immediately."*



- Tier 3 (Critical Speed Threshold - for example, 120 mph): Officers must stop and await supervisor termination decision via radio, with continuation requiring explicit authorization based on extraordinary circumstances.
 - *Real-life application: Officer radios "[Supervisor Identifying Info], approaching 120 mph, stopping pursuit pending your decision." Supervisor must actively decide "Authorized to continue - extraordinary circumstances" or "Pursuit terminated, resume patrol."*

Option 2: Technology-Enhanced Implementation (if automated notification technology is available)

- Tier 1 (Moderate Speed Threshold - for example, 85 mph): Automated system alert to the designated supervisor requiring acknowledgment and tactical assessment of environmental conditions before pursuit continuation.
 - *Real-life application: Supervisor receives automated CAD alert showing "[Car Number] - 85 mph - Highway 35 - Clear conditions." Supervisor clicks "Continue" or "Intervene" based on real-time assessment.*
- Tier 2 (High Speed Threshold - for example, 100 mph): Automated system alert requiring the designated supervisor to make an active continuation decision based on evolving circumstances and risk factors.
 - *Real-life application: Supervisor receives CAD alert with pursuit data and environmental factors displayed. Must actively select "Authorize Continuation" or "Terminate Pursuit" - no default option.*
- Tier 3 (Critical Speed Threshold - for example, 120 mph): Automated system alert triggering mandatory supervisor evaluation for termination, with continuation requiring explicit authorization based on extraordinary circumstances.
 - *Real-life application: CAD system presents termination screen to supervisor with "Terminate Pursuit" pre-selected. Supervisor must actively override with "Continue - Extraordinary Circumstances" and provide brief justification.*

The department should establish specific thresholds based on analysis of local conditions, crash data, and consultation with traffic safety experts. These thresholds should be supported by policy language that clarifies the "endanger life or property" standard within the department's operational context. Option 2 would integrate with existing CAD infrastructure to provide the designated supervisor with real-time situational awareness including traffic density, weather conditions, time of day, and proximity to schools or hospitals. Both approaches would provide structured oversight while maintaining the flexibility needed for emergency operations, ultimately reducing both risk exposure and the current high rate of speed-related violations reflected in the data.

This tiered system supplements, rather than replaces, existing pursuit authorization requirements outlined in General Order 305.03.G, which focuses on initial crime-based justification for pursuit initiation. The speed-based tiers create ongoing supervisory intervention points throughout the pursuit as risk factors escalate, addressing the reality that pursuit conditions change rapidly and a justified pursuit at moderate speeds may become unreasonably dangerous at higher speeds. This



approach provides multiple opportunities for supervisory reassessment and termination decisions, potentially preventing the types of speed-related violations that comprised a significant portion of the 291 policy violations identified in this review.

Conclusion

This review represents a pivotal opportunity for the Fort Worth Police Department to critically assess the systemic factors driving pursuit-related policy violations and operational inconsistencies. The patterns identified throughout this report point to deeper organizational challenges that require strategic, department-wide responses.

The data confirms that current pursuit protocols, supervisory practices, and post-incident review processes are not operating as intended across the board. Inconsistencies in authorization, gaps in documentation, uneven disciplinary outcomes, and a lack of structured follow-up have created conditions where risk is too often absorbed rather than managed. Importantly, the review does not suggest these issues stem from a lack of commitment or capability among officers or supervisors. Rather, they reflect areas where systems, structures, and expectations are misaligned with the complex realities of high-stakes field operations.

OPOM remains committed to supporting FWPD's continued progress toward safer, smarter, and more accountable policing. The recommendations offered—ranging from procedural refinements and technological enhancements to supervisory training and early intervention strategies—are grounded in both local data and national best practices. Implemented effectively, they offer a roadmap not only to reduce violations but to elevate the standard of pursuit management across the department.

Ultimately, the goal is not to ensure that unavoidable risks are justified, calculated, and appropriately overseen. By strengthening policy adherence, enhancing real-time decision-making, and reinforcing the accountability framework, the department can better protect officers, community members, and the integrity of its mission.

Appendix: References

International Association of Chiefs of Police. Resolution on pursuit policy standards and training requirements.

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Fatal crashes involving police pursuits, 2020 data.

Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS Office). "Vehicular Pursuit Management: Balancing Risks and Enhancing Safety" training program.

Police Executive Research Forum. "Vehicular Pursuits: A Guide for Law Enforcement Executives on Managing the Associated Risks."

Key Actions for Implementation

1. Refine Pursuit Authorization Protocols
 - Consider a default termination approach where pursuits automatically end after 60 seconds without explicit supervisor authorization broadcast over radio
2. Strengthen Supervisor Accountability
 - Hold supervisors to the same disciplinary framework as officers who violate pursuit protocols
 - Require supervisors to complete post-pursuit debriefings within 24 hours of any pursuit occurring under their supervision, regardless of outcome
3. Align Disciplinary Actions with Policy Standards
 - Reserve mitigating factors for truly extraordinary circumstances, such as genuine life-threatening emergencies or equipment failures beyond an officer's control
 - Require written justification approved by a Deputy Chief or higher when mitigating factors are applied
 - Implement annual reporting to identify patterns that indicate systemic policy challenges rather than individual officer issues
4. Expand Pursuit-Specific Training and Development
 - Develop training programs that incorporate the specific scenarios appearing in the violation data, particularly proper classification of "on-view felonies"
 - Provide supervisors with specialized training on real-time pursuit management, including guidance on when and how to intervene during active situations
5. Leverage Technology for Review Accuracy and Real-Time Support
 - Explore automated alert systems that notify supervisors when pursuits exceed predetermined risk thresholds
 - Conduct a department-wide audit of the current fleet to verify ICC installation and operational functionality
 - Request a comprehensive technology assessment to determine current system capabilities and implementation requirements
6. Implement Early Intervention for Repeat Violations
 - Develop systems to flag officers with multiple pursuit-related violations and ensure timely follow-up
 - Provide individualized coaching including ride-alongs with experienced supervisors, simulation training for high-stress decision-making, or mentorship programs
7. Establish Departmental Speed Thresholds Within Texas Law Framework
 - Establish a three-tiered speed intervention system with specific thresholds based on analysis of local conditions, crash data, and consultation with traffic safety experts
 - Implement either manual radio-based protocols or technology-enhanced automated alert systems depending on current technological capabilities
 - Support thresholds with policy language that clarifies the "endanger life or property" standard within the department's operational context





Purpose

The Office of Police Oversight Monitor (OPOM) conducted a department-wide review of 96 vehicle pursuits that occurred between April and September of 2024. The review aimed to identify systemic trends, recurring gaps, and opportunities to strengthen pursuit-related decision-making risk management and internal review processes. The purpose of this memo is to formally outline the department's revisions to policy, training, and technology in response to the thoughtful recommendations put forth by OPOM.

1. Refine Pursuit Authorization Protocols

OPOM Recommendation: Consider a default termination approach where pursuits automatically end after sixty (60) seconds without explicit supervisor authorization broadcast over the radio.

Policy Revision: General Order 305.03(0)(2) now states that officers shall not continue a pursuit without explicit authorization from a supervisor over the radio within approximately one minute from the time of initiating the pursuit.

OPOM Recommendation: Establish backup authorization protocols for situations where primary supervisors are unavailable.

Policy Revision: General Order 305.03(F){8} now states that if no field supervisor from the initiating division responds, the dispatcher shall brief a field supervisor from an adjacent division and request that they switch radio channels to assume supervisory responsibilities of the pursuit.

Other Procedural Changes: Communications personnel are now required to make a clear announcement when a pursuit enters into a different division, whether or not the pursuit has already been approved, or reiterate the need for a designated supervisor if one has not yet been assigned. Attempts to notify a supervisor are now noted on the CAD call sheet with "PRSGT" to document ongoing efforts to ensure supervisors are made aware and to prompt approval or termination of pursuits.

2. Strengthen Supervisor Accountability

OPOM Recommendation: Hold supervisors to the same disciplinary framework as officers who violate pursuit protocols.

Policy Revision: General Order 305.03(8){8} now states that failure to acknowledge a pursuit by an on-duty field supervisor assigned to the division where the pursuit was initiated, regardless of whether the initiating officer is a direct report, may constitute failure to supervise. This revision is intended to sharpen expectations for determining continuation/termination, coordinating units, and ensuring compliance. It places a shared responsibility for all supervisors on duty, regardless of whether the pursuit involves a direct report.

Pursuit Disciplinary Matrix: Multiple sections of the pursuit policy, as it relates to Failure to Supervise, have been deemed a "Moderate Policy Violation" in the Pursuits section of the Disciplinary Matrix.

POLICE DEPARTMENT



OPOM Recommendation: Require supervisors to complete post-pursuit debriefings within 24 hours of any pursuit occurring under their supervision, regardless of outcome.

Policy Revision: While debriefs are not specifically required by policy, they are encouraged at roll calls to enable the Sergeant to provide timely feedback, coaching, and mentoring to the officers to strengthen decision-making, policy compliance, and capture lessons learned. General Order 305.03{N}{3}{b} now states that the initiating officer's direct supervisor shall review the offense report, generate the administrative pursuit report, and forward the report to the proper chain of command for review. This change requires accountability for a direct report's actions, regardless of which field supervisor approved the report and took on the designated supervisor role operationally.

3. Align Disciplinary Actions with Policy Standards

OPOM Recommendation: Reserve mitigating factors for truly extraordinary circumstances, such as genuine life-threatening emergencies or equipment failures beyond an officer's control. Require written justification approved by a Deputy Chief or higher when mitigating factors are applied.

Revision to Disciplinary Matrix: A Pursuits section of the Disciplinary Matrix was created. Previously, all pursuit violations were listed in just one place, regardless of the violation's severity, which led to the mitigation of minor policy violations. By creating minor, moderate, and severe categories of pursuit policy violations, we believe this will reinforce accountability, reduce the use of mitigating factors, and increase consistency and fairness of disciplinary application throughout the department.

When mitigating factors are cited by the chain of command and discipline will fall outside of the disciplinary range in the matrix, the administrative pursuit report will need to be sent through the chain of command to the Executive Assistant Chief {EAC} level. Only the EAC can approve pursuit discipline outside of the matrix.

OPOM Recommendation: Implement annual reporting to identify patterns that indicate systemic policy challenges rather than individual officer issues.

Policy Revision: Policy was updated to reflect that Internal Affairs, not the Training Division, is responsible for providing an annual pursuit report by the end of February each year. The report is based on data from administrative pursuit reports to identify trends and draw conclusions about safety or tactical improvements, such as policy changes, training, or equipment.

4. Expand Pursuit-Specific Training and Development

OPOM Recommendation: Provide recurring, scenario-based training to reinforce pursuit-related policy, risk assessment, and field decision-making. Develop training programs that incorporate the specific scenarios appearing in the violation data. Scenario-based training could help officers practice real-time decision-making under pressure.

Training Offered: The Training Division created an ongoing six (6) hour Pursuit Tactics training course, which discusses updates to the pursuit policy, provides scenarios on how the policy is applicable, and allows time to ask the Patrol Bureau Assistant Chief {when available} any questions about the changes. The officers then spend the remainder of the course out on the driving track, simulating pursuits and the

POLICE DEPARTMENT



tasks required in a pursuit. In addition to safe driving, the student has to effectively communicate how they would be required to on the radio, to relay necessary information to justify the pursuit.

OPOM Recommendation: Supervisors would benefit from specialized training on real-time pursuit management, including guidance on when and how to intervene during active situations.

Training Offered: A one-hour block has been included in a two-day Supervisor School, which covers the pursuit policy and an emphasis on supervisor responsibilities during a pursuit.

5. Leverage Technology for Review Accuracy

OPOM Recommendation: Explore automated alert systems that notify supervisors when pursuits exceed predetermined risk thresholds.

OPOM Recommendation: Request a comprehensive technology assessment to determine current system capabilities and implementation requirements.

Response: A comprehensive technology assessment was completed and findings are under review. Our current CAD platform is scheduled to be upgraded by the end of this calendar year. There are currently some delays and gaps in connectivity that affect performance and real-time data processing.

OPOM Recommendation: Conduct a department-wide audit of the current fleet to verify ICC installation and operational functionality.

Response: Officers are required by policy to check the functionality of all equipment in their patrol vehicle at the beginning of each shift. If there is an absence of equipment or a malfunction, a supervisor should be notified and the findings documented on the vehicle inspection form. Supervisors are following up with the Camera Program Coordinator when malfunctions are experienced during a pursuit to determine the cause and ensure the equipment is promptly repaired.

Other technologies leveraged: The department is currently exploring other available tools and techniques that provide controlled methods to bring a pursuit to a safe conclusion.

6. Implement Early Intervention for Repeat Violations

OPOM Recommendation: Develop systems to flag officers with multiple pursuit-related violations and ensure timely follow-up.

Response: The department currently employs an Early Intervention system. The system is currently being reviewed to ensure it is achieving optimal effectiveness. If a pursuit violation is identified during an administrative pursuit review, the chain of command will review the officer's disciplinary history before making any final findings or disciplinary recommendations.

OPOM Recommendation: Provide individualized coaching, including ride-alongs with experienced supervisors, simulation training for high-stress decision-making, or mentorship programs.

Response: Training Options are available in conjunction with discipline. Any of the recommended options are currently available for supervisors to utilize to improve performance.

POLICE DEPARTMENT



7. Establish Departmental Speed Thresholds Within Texas Law Framework

OPOM Recommendation: Establish a three-tiered speed intervention system with specific thresholds based on analysis of local conditions, crash data, and consultation with traffic safety experts.

OPOM Recommendation: Implement either manual radio-based protocols or technology-enhanced automated alert systems, depending on current technological capabilities.

OPOM Recommendation: Support thresholds with policy language that clarified the "endanger life or property" standard with the department's operational context.

Response: This is an area where recommendations have not been implemented. We continue to rely on our officers and supervisors to constantly weigh pursuit risk factors and conditions to determine whether to initiate, continue, or terminate a pursuit.

Conclusion

Following OPOM's pursuit review, the pursuit policy was updated to strongly align with several major OPOM recommendations, particularly in the areas of supervisor accountability, authorization protocols, documentation, and oversight. In addition to the changes highlighted in this memo, other policy changes were made to improve officer safety and to allow for officers to serve in a traffic control function during pursuits on the freeway to increase the safety of the general public.

POLICE DEPARTMENT



OPOM Recommendation: Support thresholds with policy language that clarified the "endanger life or property" standard with the department's operational context.

Response: This is an area where recommendations have not been implemented. We continue to rely on our officers and supervisors to constantly weigh pursuit risk factors and conditions to determine whether to initiate, continue, or terminate a pursuit.

Conclusion

Following OPOM's pursuit review, the pursuit policy was updated to strongly align with several major OPOM recommendations, particularly in the areas of supervisor accountability, authorization protocols, documentation, and oversight. In addition to the changes highlighted in this memo, other policy changes were made to improve officer safety and to allow for officers to serve in a traffic control function during pursuits on the freeway to increase the safety of the general public.

Eddie Garcia

Chief of Police

POLICE DEPARTMENT

CITY OF FORT WORTH * Bos BOLEN PUBLIC SAFETY COMPLEX * 505 WEST FEUX STREET * FORT WORTH, TEXAS 76115
817-392-4200 * FAX 817-392-4216