The City of
SAN DIEGO
Commission on Police Practices

COMMISSION ON POLICE PRACTICES
Thursday, September 25, 2025
5:00pm

<u>POLICY STANDING COMMITTEE AGENDA</u>
Procopio Towers
525 B St.
17th Floor, Suite 1725
San Diego, CA 92101

[MICROSOFT TEAMS LINK](#)
Meeting ID: 240 850 772 906 7
Passcode: Ga377Hf6

The Commission on Police Practices (Commission) meetings will be conducted pursuant to the provisions of California Government Code Section 54953 (a), as amended by Assembly Bill 2249.

The Commission business meetings will be in person and the meeting will be open for in-person testimony. Additionally, we are continuing to provide alternatives to in-person attendance for participating in our meetings. In lieu of in-person attendance, members of the public may also participate via telephone/Teams.

In-Person Public Comment on an Agenda Item: If you wish to address the CPP Standing Committee on an item on today's agenda, please complete and submit a speaker slip before the Committee hears the agenda item. You will be called at the time the item is heard. Each speaker must file a speaker slip with the CPP staff at the meeting at which the speaker wishes to speak indicating which item they wish to speak on. Speaker slips may not be turned in prior to the day of the meeting or after completion of in-person testimony. In-person public comment will conclude before virtual testimony begins. Each speaker who wishes to address the Commission must state who they are representing if they represent an organization or another person.

For discussion and information items each speaker may speak for up to three (3) minutes, subject to the Committee Chair's determination of the time available for meeting management purposes, in addition to any time ceded by other members of the public who are present at the meeting and have submitted a speaker slip ceding their time. These speaker slips should be submitted together at one time to the designated CPP staff. The Committee Chair may also limit organized group presentations of five or more people to 15 minutes or less.

In-Person Public Comment on Matters Not on the Agenda: You may address the Standing Committee on any matter not listed on today's agenda. Please complete and submit a speaker slip. However, California's open meeting laws do not permit the

1

Standing Committee to discuss or take any action on the matter at today's meeting. At its discretion, the Standing Committee may add the item to a future meeting agenda or refer the matter to the CPP. Public comments are limited to three minutes per speaker. At the discretion of the Committee Chair, if a large number of people wish to speak on the same item, comments may be limited to a set period of time per item to appropriately manage the meeting and ensure the Standing Committee has time to consider all the agenda items. A member of the public may only provide one comment per agenda item. In-person public comment on items not on the agenda will conclude before virtual testimony begins.

Written Comment through Webform: Comment on agenda items and non-agenda public comment may also be submitted using the webform. If using the webform, indicate the agenda item number you wish to submit a comment for. All webform comments are limited to 200 words. On the webform, members of the public should select Commission on Police Practices (even if the public comment is for a Commission on Police Practices Committee meeting).

The public may attend a meeting when scheduled by following the attendee meeting link provided above. To view a meeting archive video, click here. Video footage of each Commission meeting is posted online here within 72 hours of the conclusion of the meeting.

Comments received no later than 8 am the day of the meeting will be distributed to the Commission on Police Practices. Comments received after the deadline described above but before the item is called will be submitted into the written record for the relevant item.

Written Materials: You may alternatively submit via U.S. Mail to Attn: Office of the Commission on Police Practices, 525 B Street, Suite 1725, San Diego, CA 92101. Materials submitted via U.S. Mail must be received the business day prior to the meeting to be distributed to the Standing Committee.

If you attach any documents to your comment, they will be distributed to the Standing Committee in accordance with the deadlines described above.

Late-Arriving Materials
This paragraph relates to those documents received after the agenda is publicly noticed and during the 72 hours prior to the start of, or during, the meeting. Pursuant to the Brown Act, (California Government Code Section 54957.5(b)) late-arriving documents, related to the Commission on Police Practices' ("CPP") meeting agenda items, which are distributed to the legislative body prior to and/or during the CPP meeting are available for public review by appointment in the Office of the CPP located at Procopio Towers, 525 B Street, Suite 1725, San Diego, CA 92101. Appointments for public review may be made by calling (619) 533-5304 and coordinating with CPP staff before visiting the office. Late-arriving documents may also be obtained by email request to CPP staff at commissiononpolicepractices@sandiego.gov . Late-arriving materials received prior to the CPP meeting will also be available for review, at the CPP public meeting, by making a verbal request of CPP staff located in the CPP meeting. Late-arriving materials received during the CPP meeting will be available for reviewing the following workday at the CPP offices noted above or by email request to CPP staff.

    I.   CALL TO ORDER/WELCOME (Committee Chair Imani Robinson)

    II.   ROLL CALL (Policy Manager Aaron Burgess)

Committee Members: Committee Chair Imani Robinson, CPP Chair Ada Rodriguez,
Alec Beyer, Doug Case, Stephen Chatzky, Lupe Diaz, Armando Flores

III. NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT (Policy Manager Aaron Burgess)

IV. APPROVAL OF THE July 31st MEETING MINUTES (Policy Manager Aaron Burgess)

V. NEW BUSINESS
   A. Committee Members and Seats Available for the Committee
   B. Policy Retreat Run of Show (Informational Item)
   C. AI Policy (Discussion)
   D. Possible Future Items (Discussion)

VI. Next Meeting Date: October 23, 2025 at 5pm.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Materials Provided:
   - July 31st Meeting Minutes

Access for People with Disabilities: As required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), requests for agenda information to be made available in alternative formats, and any requests for disability-related modifications or accommodations required to facilitate meeting participation, including requests for alternatives to observing meetings and offering public comment as noted above, may be made by contacting the Commission at (619) 533-5304 or commissiononpolicepractices@sandiego.gov.

Requests for disability-related modifications or accommodations required to facilitate meeting participation, including requests for auxiliary aids, services, or interpreters, require different lead times, ranging from five business days to two weeks. Please keep this in mind and provide as much advance notice as possible to ensure availability. The city is committed to resolving accessibility requests swiftly.

The City of SAN DIEGO

Commission on Police Practices

COMMISSION ON POLICE PRACTICES
POLICY STANDING COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES

Thursday, July 31, 2025
5:00pm-6:00pm

Procopio Towers
17th Floor, Suite 1725
San Diego, CA 92101

Click https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dmJjhVbI4nE to view this meeting on YouTube.

CPP Committee Members Present:
Chair Imani Robinson
1st Vice Chair Ada Rodriguez
Alec Beyer
Doug Case
Stephen Chatzky
Lupe Diaz

Excused:	**Absent:**
Armando Flores	None

CPP Staff Present:
Aaron Burgess, Policy Manager

I. CALL TO ORDER/WELCOME: Chair Imani Robinson called the meeting to order at 5:00pm.

II. ROLL CALL: Policy Manager Aaron Burgess conducted the roll call for the Commission and established quorum.

III. NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT
Virtual Public Comment by Andrea Ebbing: Andrea Ebbing shared her experience and concerns regarding a complaint filed in September 2024 involving several officers. She detailed the severe abuse she suffered and the lack of support from the authorities. Andrea requested the Commission's help in reopening the complaint and addressing the issues.

IV. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES
Motion: Commissioner Alec Beyer moved to approve the CPP Policy Standing Committee Meeting Minutes of June 26th. Commissioner Stephen Chatzky seconded the motion. The motion passed with a vote of 5-0-1.
Yeas: 1st Vice Chair Rodriguez, Beyer, Chatzky, Diaz, and Robinson
Nays: None
Abstained: Case

V. NEW BUSINESS
A. Policy Retreat Run of Show
Policy Retreat Planning: Policy Manager Aaron Burgess and the committee discussed the agenda for the upcoming policy retreat, including staff introductions, policy recommendations, and the involvement of issue experts. They also considered the inclusion of a liaison from SDPD to improve communication and collaboration.
Policy Recommendations: The committee discussed the process for making policy recommendations, including the 60-day response time from the police department and the lifecycle of a policy recommendation from research to public hearing.
Issue Experts: The committee considered inviting issue experts, such as Professor Sharon Farley and Jerry Threet, to provide insights on policy issues. They also discussed the potential involvement of a liaison from SDPD to improve communication and collaboration.
Retreat Logistics: The committee planned to send out a poll to determine the best date for the retreat and discussed the importance of having a structured and focused agenda to ensure effective discussions and outcomes.
B. Policy Research Intake Form
Policy Research Intake Form: Policy Manager Aaron Burgess introduced the Policy Research Intake Form, which will be used by Commissioners to submit policy issues for review. The form includes sections for topic area, type of submission, description, and supporting information. The committee discussed the process for prioritizing and addressing these submissions.
Form Introduction: Policy Manager Aaron Burgess introduced the Policy Research Intake Form, explaining its purpose and structure. The form includes sections for the topic area, type of submission, description, and supporting information to help Commissioners submit policy issues for review.
Submission Process: The committee discussed the process for submitting and prioritizing policy issues. Commissioners can submit ideas via the form, which

will then be reviewed and prioritized by the Policy Committee based on urgency and relevance.

Form Details: The form allows for detailed descriptions of policy issues, including the type of submission (e.g., policy recommendation, review of existing policy, research), and the ability to upload supporting documents. It also includes a section for indicating the level of urgency.

Implementation Plan: The committee planned to introduce the form before and during the retreat, ensuring that all Commissioners understand how to use it effectively. They also discussed the importance of follow-up and communication regarding submitted forms.

Virtual Public Comment by Andrea Ebbing: Andrea Ebbing provided additional information about the "other pay" issue and its potential connection to kickbacks from rehab facilities. She encouraged the committee to investigate this further and thanked them for their work.

VI.   NEXT MEETING – Thursday, August 27, 2025

VII. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 6:11pm.

From:	Burgess Jr., Aaron
To:	Conde, Alina
Subject:	Fw: [Deliberative/Confidential] Proposed Draft Policy: SDPD Use of Generative AI
Date:	Monday, September 22, 2025 3:30:36 PM
Attachments:	Outlook-bi0ox02i.png
	Outlook-d2crmzul.png

Magnanimously,

Aaron Burgess Jr.

Chief of Staff
Office of the Commission on Police Practices

☎ c▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮
🌐 www.sandiego.gov/cpp
✉ ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮
📍 Procopio Tower - 525 B Street, Suite 1725, SD, CA 92101

To subscribe or unsubscribe from our email updates list, please visit: Bit.ly/CPPnewsletter

CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION
This electronic mail message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the addressee(s) named above and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not an intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this e-mail to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you received this e-mail message in error, please immediately notify the sender by replying to this message or by telephone.

From: Burgess Jr., Aaron ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮
Sent: Friday, August 29, 2025 2:51 PM
To: Robinson, Imani <▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮ Rodriguez, Ada ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮
Cc: Miesfeld, Bart <▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮ Golub, Olga ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮
Bonnie <▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮ Honoré, Clovis ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮
Subject: [Deliberative/Confidential] Proposed Draft Policy: SDPD Use of Generative AI

Hello Leaders,

AI use in policing is growing nationwide. Departments from New York to Los Angeles are already experimenting with AI-assisted tools. SDPD is beginning to encounter Generative Artificial Intelligence tools such as ChatGPT, Copilot, Gemini, and other text, image, and speech generators. While these tools can improve efficiency, they also pose risks around accuracy, privacy, bias, and community trust. Without policy, SDPD risks inconsistent use, community backlash, and legal exposure.

At the recent NACOLE Regional Conference in San Francisco, I attended a presentation by Chief Susan Manheimer (ret.) of the Policing Futures Institute on the opportunities and risks of

Generative Artificial Intelligence in policing. The session emphasized the urgent need for law enforcement agencies to adopt clear policies to guide AI use, given both the rapid pace of technological change and the heightened community expectations around transparency and accountability. The conversation made clear that agencies nationwide are beginning to adopt these tools, but few have set clear policies to manage their use responsibly.

I'm sharing a draft policy adapted from COP.ai.com that could serve as a strong foundation for SDPD. The draft emphasizes transparency, privacy protections, and limits on sensitive uses, while still allowing the department to benefit from the efficiency gains AI can provide.

[Aaron Burgess Copy of GAI Model Policy (final).docx - Google Docs](#)

My recommendation:

I recommend we place a draft on the upcoming Policy Committee agenda for discussion, with the goal of refining it into a formal recommendation for SDPD.

Next Steps:
- Adopt the draft model policy to SDPD
- Create a CPP resolution recommending adoption of a policy on the Use of Generative AI by SDPD
- Bring to Policy Committee for vote of approval
- Send resolution to leaders for signature
- Send to SDPD as a formal recommendation

This email was prepared with minor assistance from artificial intelligence for drafting purposes. All content has been reviewed and approved by the sender.

Magnanimously,

Aaron Burgess Jr.

SD Chief of Staff
Office of the Commission on Police Practices

☎ ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮
🌐 www.sandiego.gov/cpp
✉ ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮
📍 Procopio Tower - 525 B Street, Suite 1725, SD, CA 92101

To subscribe or unsubscribe from our email updates list, please visit: Bit.ly/CPPnewsletter

**A Model Policy for the use of
Generative Artificial Intelligence by Police Agencies**

Policy/General Order: Departmental use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) Algorithms

1. Purpose
The purpose of this policy is to establish guidelines for the use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) tools, like Large Language Model artificial intelligence algorithms, within the Police Department. AI tools can have significant benefits to the department in terms of effectiveness and efficiency. However, there are also concerns surrounding this rapidly evolving technology. By issuing this policy, it is the intent of the department to ensure that AI is used responsibly, ethically, and effectively by all members of this department.

GAI technologies are advancing at an exponential rate. Generally, the criminal justice system's policies, practices, regulations, legislation, and case law have not kept pace with AI's rapid evolution. As a result, the department is taking a responsible and measured approach to the implementation of AI. As the utility and challenges of GAI technologies become clearer, our guidelines will undoubtedly change to clarify the authorized uses and restrictions of this powerful technology.

2. Applicability and responsibility
This policy applies to all sworn officers, civilian personnel, volunteers, and other members of the department. It is the responsibility of all department members who interact with AI technologies in the performance of their official duties to be aware of, and adhere to, the guidelines set forth in this policy.

3. Definitions

- **Artificial Intelligence (AI):** Artificial intelligence (AI) refers to the simulation of human intelligence processes by machines, typically through the use of algorithms to automate tasks by rapidly processing and analyzing large amounts of data, and then present the results from this analysis in such a way that would typically require human intelligence.

- **Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI):** This refers to a broad set of technologies that use machine learning techniques to generate content in response to user inputs. They can generate text, still images, video, speech, and music.

- **Large Language Models (LLM)**: LLMs are a subset of GAI. They are advanced natural language processing models powered by AI. They are designed to generate human-like text responses, images, speech, or music based on the input they receive. Examples of

these include OpenAi's *ChatGPT*, Microsoft's *Copilot*, Meta's *LLaMA2,* Google's *Gemini*, *Mistral 7B, Claude*, etc. They also include the image generating tools like *DALL-E, Canva or MidJourney* and music generating tools like *AIVA, MusicLM, Soundraw* or *Amadeus Code*.

- **Text-to-Speech systems (TTS):** A type of AI technology designed to transform written text into spoken language.

- **Voice cloning or voice synthesis systems:** Programs that learn the characteristics of an individual's voice by processing audio data collected from audio samples and produce new speech that sounds exactly like their original speaker's. Examples include ElevenLabs' products or Amazon's *Polly.*

- **Authorized user:** Department members having successfully completed department authorized training in the use of GAI. These members are also referred to as "trained members." This category also includes those who have been granted "one-time" supervisory permission to use a GAI tool for a specific authorized purpose.

5. Applicability to personal computers or devices

All provisions of this policy shall apply to the use of personal computers or portable devices by members of this department when they are using any form of AI to complete a departmental work product or to work on any departmentally related project.

6. Responsibilities when using GAI tools

6.1 While GAI tools offer significant benefits, experts also recognize potential pitfalls and ethical considerations in their use. Text generating algorithms can make mistakes, embellish statements, and even fabricate "facts" in their responses. Speech generating tools can deceive people into believing a voice is the authentic voice of a person it appears to be. And image producing LLMs can generate images which appear to depict something that did not occur.

6.2 It is the responsibility of department members using GAI tools to ensure the output or product created by the tools they are using are accurate, reliable, and consistent with the department's ethical guidelines and legal requirements or prohibitions. In the case of image, voice or music generation, department users must also ensure the outputs are in good taste, don't violate any of the department's ethical guidelines or legal restrictions and are not offensive.

7. Ethical Considerations and compliance with ethical standards

7.1 For the use of AI technologies like GAI tools in policing to be ethical, they must be used in a manner that upholds constitutional rights, protects privacy, avoids bias, ensures accuracy, and follows legal guidelines and requirements. To address these concerns, the department may employ an evaluation framework, transparent methodologies, and monitoring through both planned and random audits of AI assisted tasks to detect errors, ensure policy compliance, mitigate the potential for bias and ensure the ethical deployment of AI by members of this department.

7.2 Department members shall not assume that outputs from GAI tools are automatically appropriate and non-offensive to residents of diverse ethnic, racial, and gender groups. If there is the slightest reasonable concern that they may be offensive, department members should not consider using them, or, if used with supervisory approval, they should ensure they consider the impacts of any potential bias as a part of their results. Department members and supervisors shall error on the side of caution when considering this issue.

7.3 When using any AI based technology, department members shall be required to comply with all departmental ethical standards and expectations for behavior, just as they are required to follow in other areas or activities under control of the department. All other policies that provide direction for behavior and responsibilities shall be applicable in the use of AI.

8. Privacy and Data Protection
8.1 Without prior authorization, department personnel shall not input confidential or other law enforcement sensitive information into AGI tools without explicit prior authorization from the Chief of Police or the Chief's designee. This includes names, dates of birth, driver's license numbers, social security numbers, home addresses or other types of personally identifiable information (PII) of victims, witnesses, or suspects.

8.2 Claims that a particular AI tool is "safe and secure" for users to input any form of sensitive information shall be vetted by the department before personnel will be permitted to use the tool with sensitive departmental information or data. The approval for using an AI tool in this manner lies solely with the Chief of Police or the Chief's designee.

9. Transparency, Accountability, and the Public Trust
9.1 To further promote public trust and transparency of police operations, the department shall periodically convene public forums to discuss its use of technology – including the use of artificial intelligence. Concerns expressed to the department by community, government, or department stakeholders regarding the use of AI technology shall be identified and addressed as part of this disclosure.

9.2 The department shall publicly disclose the AI tools it uses, the rationale for their use, and a summary report of general findings from audits regarding the use of GAI tools, and what if any measures were necessary to correct deficiencies.

10. Prohibited use of LLMs
Unless they have been approved by the department, the use of LLMs to perform departmental tasks or write departmental reports is prohibited in the following instances:

1. There is a reasonable expectation the information contained within the report(s) or document(s) could be used in a criminal or civil proceeding.
2. When the report(s) or document(s) is to be presented to a prosecutor or judge for review and/or for use in a judicial procedure.
3. To document criminal incidents in which a suspect, victim or witness is named, identified, or there is a reasonable likelihood that he/she will be identified.
4. To document criminal incidents to which there are potential leads to support further investigation.
5. To document traffic accidents including the names and other personal identifying information of the victims, or support the issuance of a citation; and,
6. To document missing persons or runaway juveniles.
7. To document policy violations or personnel issues or evaluations.

11. Duty to Disclose
Departmental users of GAI tools are required to disclose their use to the appropriate supervisor in the following circumstance:

a. The use of AI might reasonably become a contentious or debated issue.
b. Users have used a LLM to assist in the writing of a memorandum or report. They must disclose their use of the LLM to the supervisor(s) reviewing the report or memorandum.
c. When, despite departmental policy, an LLM-assisted report becomes part of a criminal or civil proceeding. Users employing the LLM to assist in the writing of the document, or any member aware of this fact, must disclose the use of the LLM to the appropriate prosecutor or the appropriate counsel representing the City in the civil action.

12. Use of GAI tool
12.1 Prior Training Required
Only personnel who have received departmentally approved training in the use of GAI tools are authorized to use them for departmental purposes. Exceptions to this must be approved by a supervisor or when there is a clear exigent circumstance requiring the use of the GAI tools.

12.2 Authorized uses of GAI tools
The use of GAI tools to assist in routine tasks such as writing staff reports or memorandums, general report writing, generating images, speech-to-text, etc. is authorized under the following conditions and institutionally defined as appropriate. Any other use requires the explicit approval of a supervisor or the presence of a clear exigent circumstance requiring the use of the GAI tools.

12.2.1 Staff reports, inter and intra departmental memorandums, or community communications

a. Trained users may use GAI tools to create staff reports or memorandums to be used within the department or for communications to other City departments, or outside the department when communicating to other governmental entities or the public. Users

should restrict their use to the introductory and background portions of their writings. They should themselves author the portions specific to a particular problem, issue, location, person, etc. to avoid the production of AI generated embellishments, errors, or fabrications.

b. Users must review the finished document for accuracy before conveying it to the intended recipient.

c. It is the responsibility of the user to ensure the document's approving supervisor (if there is one) is informed of the use of a LLM to assist in the writing of the document.

12.2.2 Infraction and misdemeanor reports

Trained users may use LLMs to assist in creating certain authorized crime or incident reports, but users must review and edit the drafts to ensure accuracy and completeness. Trained users may utilize LLMs to create infraction or misdemeanor reports when the cases are:

1. Without named or identified suspects.
2. Without identifiable leads.
3. Without a reasonable expectation they will be used in criminal or civil proceeding; and,
4. Authorized by a supervisor.
5. It is the responsibility of the user to ensure the approving supervisor is informed of the use of a LLM to assist in the writing of the report.

12.2.3 Other crime reports

Upon approval by the department, members may be authorized to use LLM tools to write other, more serious crime reports. This approval will be issued by the Chief of Police or the Chief's designee after an evaluation of the tool under consideration, consultation with the appropriate legal authorities and evaluation of the training needs and implications for the use of the LLM's.

13.4 Complex reports

When authoring complex reports, trained users should exercise discretion when using LLMs. The more complex the issue or report, the greater the opportunities for errors. Users must carefully balance the benefit of using LLMs for these reports against their potential for error.

a. Supervisors must carefully review, before approving, any reports generated by LLMs for complex cases.

b. It is the responsibility of the user to ensure the approving supervisor is informed of the use of a LLM to assist in the writing of the report.

c. LLMs can assist in creating initial drafts, but users must review and edit the drafts to ensure accuracy and completeness.

14. Supervisory Responsibilities regarding the use of GAI tools

Once a supervisor becomes aware a document or image submitted by a subordinate was AI-assisted, they are responsible for ensuring adherence to departmental GAI policies and guidelines. Any infractions by officers of this policy should be handled in accordance with standard disciplinary procedures.

15. Handling Citizen Complaints Written with LLMs
15.1 Accepting supervisor's responsibility

    a. When a supervisor accepts a citizen's complaint, they shall ask the complainant if any portion of the complaint was authored by, or with the assistance of, a LLM like ChatGPT. This includes handwritten complaints unless the individual completed the complaint in view of the supervisor. The supervisor shall explain that there is no prohibition against the individual doing so, but, because LLM are known to occasionally embellish or fabricate parts of writings, it is important to ensure the LLM did not write something the complainant did not intend to have written.

    b. If the complainant indicates he/she used an LLM, the supervisor shall document that fact and forward it along with the complaint.

    c. Supervisors accepting the complaint shall refrain from criticizing the complainant for his/her use of an LLM.

    d. If the complainant submits an image, video, or audio recording along with the written text of the complaint, the supervisor shall follow the above steps to try and determine the specifics, accuracy, and intent of the attachment.

15.2 Investigative responsibilities

    a. During the initial assessment of the complaint, investigating personnel shall evaluate it to determine if it appears to have been written by using an LLM. Characteristics that should be considered are the context, wording, tone, and clarity of the complaint and/or its attachments.

    b. When interviewing complainants, investigating personnel should ask the complainant if they used a LLM to assist in writing the complaint. If one was used, an attempt should be made to determine which parts were authored by the LLM, which by the complainant, and the accuracy of the statements created by the LLM.

    c. Investigating personnel shall refrain from criticizing the complainant for his/her use of an LLM.

    d. If the complainant submits an image, video, or audio recording along with the written text of the complaint, the investigating personnel should follow the above steps to try and determine the specifics, accuracy, and intent of the attachment.

16. Review and Revision

This policy will be reviewed as frequently as necessary and updated to reflect new departmental knowledge and understanding of AI, technological advancements, best practices and legislative or regulatory changes or requirements.