PORTLAND CITY AUDITOR
Independent Police Review

Confidential Recorded Interview Transcript

Interview Date: 07/28/22
IPR Case #: 2022-B-0022
IPR File Name: 2022-B-0022 Gjovik, Christopher 07-28-22 interview
Complainant:

Investigator: Eric Berry
Interviewed: Christopher Gjovik

BERRY: All right, rolling.
KONCZAL: We're rolling? Okay.
BERRY: Yeah.
KONCZAL: All right. Good morning. This is Sergeant SCOTT KONCZAL. Today's date is Thursday, July 28th, 2022. Time is 0802 hours. We are having a remote interview via Zoom. Present with me is Captain CHRIS GJOVIK and IPR Investigator ERIC BERRY. We are here today for IPR investigation case number 2022-B-0022. Captain GJOVIK has been advised that his conduct or the conduct of any other Bureau member present during the course of the Portland protests in the year 2020 is the subject of this investigation. Captain GJOVIK has reviewed information necessary to be reasonably apprised of the nature of the allegation of the complaint. Captain GJOVIK has been informed that he's a witness member in the case and that IPR Director ROSS CALDWELL is in charge of the investigation. I've advised Captain GJOVIK that he could have representation present during the interview and he has chosen to proceed without representation. Captain GJOVIK, under the authority of Acting Captain PASHLEY I'm ordering you to answer all questions fully and truthfully. If you fail to respond fully and truthfully you may be disciplined up to and including dismissal. Do you understand?
GJOVIK: I do.
KONCZAL: Okay. I will now turn the interview over to IPR Investigator ERIC BERRY.
BERRY: Good morning Captain GJOVIK. I sure appreciate your time and availability this morning. Thank you.
GJOVIK: You bet. Thank you sir.
BERRY: Absolutely. Before I get you through these questions do you have any questions for me or any kind of statement you want to make in the beginning?
GJOVIK: Statement. I guess my only statement is that I took over this position in September of 2021 well after RRT had resigned and I was a member of the Internal Affairs Division from 2019 through September 2021. So, any specific questions on how RRT would train I don't have any firsthand knowledge of, but I - I'm more than happy to help if I do have any knowledge to help you out.
BERRY: Excellent. I appreciate that. And that's actually one of the first couple of questions I had for you. I appreciate you clarifying the dates of when you held what position. That'll be a help. Thank you. But something I, you know, I don't know if I've asked you in a while, how long have you been with PPB?
GJOVIK: I'm in my 23rd year. I started in February of 2000.

BERRY: All right. All right. And are you able to kind of give me a very broad description of what the Training Division is responsible for within the Police Bureau?
GJOVIK: Sure. Very broadly, kind of high level view, we are responsible for running Advanced Academy, so advanced training after people come back from the State Academy. We're also in charge of running tenured officer training. So, we call it in-service training to maintain minimum standards or I should say mandatory standards to retain people's state certifications. We also do training on specialty weapons, special skills, and we handle requests from community groups, Mayor's Office, a number of different entities to address training gaps that they believe we have.
BERRY: Excellent. Thank you very much for that. So the investigation that I hope to talk to you about today kind of relates to some concerns reportedly raised by RRT members as they were discussing their decision to resign from the team. One of the things that came up in a memo that documents that decision indicated that there were kind of conflicting standards related to the use of force between directives, training, and legal interpretations. So that's some of what I hope to talk to you today is just Training Division's piece of all that and see if you have any insight to share for the investigation. I'll just start broad and kind of work my way into hopefully more specific stuff. But generally speaking are you able to describe how trainings for a specialty or specialized unit like RRT is developed?
GJOVIK: Well that's a great question. I can tell you how it's developed now. I know before I got here it was developed somewhat differently and that there was no consistency between specialty unit to specialty unit. Our Directive 1500.00 specifically states that all training has to be approved through the Training Division Captain and has to be given 60-day window for our chain of command to do a review, basically make sure it's up to the standards of policy and procedure, and, you know, our training doctrine. I know that wasn't enforced previously unfortunately and - but now all specialty units are required to formulate lesson plans just like we do here for in-service and Advanced Academy and send them through our approval process for, you know, vetting.
BERRY: Okay, that's fine.
GJOVIK: In the past I know that was sporadic. So, I'm not sure if the RRT specific lesson plans were vetted or not.
BERRY: That was gonna be my next question. So, to your knowledge it sounds like that wasn't always the procedure that was carried out before where stuff was given that 60-day window and -
GJOVIK: Correct. Those are the gaps that we're trying to close at this point right now.
BERRY: Okay. Generally speaking, well, okay on the little - I'll have to make this effort to make a distinction between how things are done now versus how things are done then, and I'm interested in hearing about both. Obviously the focus of the investigation will be on how things were done back then. But I wonder, so starting with now kind of generally speaking who develops the training material for a specialized unit? Is it the members of the unit themselves or the (Crosstalk).
GJOVIK: Yes. The members of the unit themselves with assistance from - with the Training Division. So building a lesson plan isn't the most intuitive thing. So, we typically will kind of, I don’t want to use this derogatorily, but we handhold through the process to make sure that they understand why the steps are there, but they develop the content. Their RU manager approves the content, and then it gets sent through our approval system.
BERRY: And then to kind of back up and ask the same question, to your knowledge, about how it was done previously before your tenure at the Training Division was it that same general approach where the members of the specialized unit would develop the material?
GJOVIK: Yes. Again, that's the way it should have been done. I don't know in this case if that was done. But yes, generally that's the way it should have been done.
BERRY: Okay. So it sound -
GJOVIK: But I don't know if it was done unfortunately.
BERRY: Right. Right. So it sounds like generally speaking the members of the specialized unit are gonna develop the material, and in terms of the difference in practice now versus how it was done before is it fair to say was there less review and consultation with the - with Training Division staff?
GJOVIK: Yeah, I would say less consistent review.

BERRY: Less consistent.
GJOVIK: Uh-huh, yeah. When there was a review the review was the same, but the consistency of every lesson plan making it through us was inconsistent.
BERRY: Well, and kind of to home in on maybe part of the inconsistency regarding - specifically regarding RRT training materials was there - was that approach different or inconsistent with other specialized units? Like did they do things their - a particular way?
GJOVIK: I don't think it was any less or any more inconsistent than any other unit.
BERRY: Okay.
GJOVIK: From what I've seen in lesson plan materials they use their own in-house subject matter expects to develop their training.
BERRY: And so that'd be similar to something like SERT or something like that. They'd be using their own in-house experts?
GJOVIK: Yeah, exactly.
BERRY: All right.
GJOVIK: Now I know SERT, for instance, is their training - and I'm just trying to give you kind of context there.
BERRY: I appreciate that.
GJOVIK: Their trainings have always been - the lesson plans have been sent to us, but their trainings are considerably different 'cause they do a lot of drill-based training. So if they have a training week - they train every Thursday, so if they have a training Thursday where they're doing building clears they already have a lesson plan that's been approved and they just pull that lesson plan, work off of it, and then submit it to us with the training roster. So their training does not vary a whole lot. Unlike a lot of RRT training that we've come up with as, you know, developing a new class based on a new issue that they're trying to train to or, you know, something like that if that makes sense.
BERRY: Some new tactic or something that they're encountering out there during protests?
GJOVIK: Yeah. Yeah.
BERRY: That makes sense. Well, so beyond the training materials themselves is there any other documentation that gets generated during that process where specialized unit is developing training?
GJOVIK: No 'cause unlike a Training Division training we actually have an analyst that works on the back-ends to take surveys and actually does a deep dive into where any training gaps might have been through those surveys. So there isn't really a, you know, kind of a bow on the end of that training. It's just open-ended. So, other than that it's - yeah, it's supposed to be lesson plan, training, and then -
BERRY: And then go. You talked about like currently there being a 60-day window, so it doesn't sound like there's a memo that gets generated at the end of that 60 days or whatever that kind of blesses the process?
GJOVIK: No. No, so the lesson plans need to come in to the chain of command at 60 days, and then specifically - and this wasn't the practice in the past, but specifically those go through the chain of command and many times they go to the DOJ, so we need that 60 day window to vet those, to make any changes possible, and then they're just notified when they're approved.
BERRY: That makes sense. All right. Well, if I can I want to - I appreciate all that information. That really helps me to kind of contextualize how those trainings get started. And I want to jump right in to the second bullet point from Lieutenant Clark's memorandum, and I'm just gonna read it real fast for the benefit of the transcript. In this memo from what I've been given to understand Lieutenant Clark wrote it following the team's decision to resign and it kind of describes some of the concerns that the team members raised as they discussed this decision, and they're broken up into broad categories, a lot of broad categories. So, the second one is, "The team feels that while relevant Bureau directives has remained unchanged the interpretation of those directives as it applies to protests has changed. Those changing interpretations eliminate the clarity needed for members to effectively do their job. Additionally there are conflicting standards between directives, training, and legal interpretations best observed in Directive 1010.00, Use of Force and Directive 0635.10, Crowd Management/Crowd Control." So, I'll

just start broad again and I'll ask you in your expertise as the current Training Division head and a former IA head are there conflicting standards regarding the use of force between Directives 0635.10 and 1010.00?
GJOVIK: Eric quite frankly I've never understood that, but I never sat through the trainings that they said that they were taught something different. Ultimately 0635.10 references 1010.00 as the standard for use of force, and I might be simplistic in my thinking, but I take that for what it's worth. And it says 1010.00 is the standard for use of force in crowd control situations.
BERRY: Excellent. Well, and just one kind of follow-up question to that. Specifically can you think of any instances in 0635.10 that describes an authorized use of force that wouldn't be authorized under 1010.00?
GJOVIK: I'm gonna have to pull it up.
BERRY: Sorry.
GJOVIK: No, that's okay. Can you give me just one -
BERRY: Yeah, absolutely. I can email you PDFs too if that's any easier. I didn't include them on (inaudible - 00:13:15).
GJOVIK: No, I got it on -
BERRY: All right.
GJOVIK: - (inaudible - 00:13:16). Part of the reason I need to upload it is 'cause we're rewriting 0635.10, so I want to make sure I get the current -
BERRY: Oh, you might have a different version floating around in your head?
GJOVIK: (Inaudible - 00:13:29).
BERRY: Yeah, that makes a lot of sense. Yeah, I mean, I can kind of give you pointers. I mean, I'm interested in looking at orders. You know, once something has reached a civil disturbance or a riot in terms of the IC or CMICs, orders to disperse or anything like that, I'm just wondering if force is addressed there in way that it's not addressed in 1010.00.
GJOVIK: Can you give me a -
BERRY: I'll clear it off then.
GJOVIK: - paragraph?
BERRY: Yeah. Well, the meat of what I'm interested in talking about starts in Section 8, Announcements and Warnings, but really we're looking at Section 9, Crowd Dispersal.
GJOVIK: Crowd dispersal, right.
BERRY: Yeah. And I don’t need to - I don’t want to put you on the spot for being responsible for remembering off the top of your head every word of this directive, but -
GJOVIK: It's certainly not one that I've used functionally out in the field.
BERRY: Absolutely.
GJOVIK: Yeah, 9.2, I mean, it gives authorization for crowd control missions and riot control agents, but 9.3 says, "Force shall be used in accordance with Directive 1010.00."
BERRY: Yeah. All right. Well that's kind of the - yeah, I think that's maybe the crux of the matter is the use of RCAs in a riot dispersal, and that'd be the only thing there, but it does look like that directive specifies that it's still gotta be used in accordance with 1010.00. I feel like it calls back to 1010.00 several times in that directive.
GJOVIK: Yeah, that was my recollection as well.
BERRY: Yeah. All right. Well okay, so moving away from the details of 0635.10 and kind of returning to Training Division systems and processes can you think of any crowd control trainings that focus in particular on the IC or the CMIC’s duties under 0635.10, and as that intersects with officers - individual officers using force under 1010.00? Like is there any training that you can think of that addresses that intersection?
GJOVIK: I am aware of some training. I don't know if it was combined training between the actual RRT Team and CMICs, but there is a series of PowerPoint sleds that - or slides that I will send you that is representative of that training.

BERRY: That'd be very useful. Yeah, thank you for that. Well, and I can review the slides and I can follow-up with you offline as well. Off the top of your head any kind of memory of like what the trainings were called, or who the instructors were or anything like that?
GJOVIK: I could tell you right now. Yeah, I mean, there was Crowd Behavior and Theory, Crowd Management Theory, Demonstrations to Riots and the progression between the two there, Planning, Using the Decision-Making Model, Planning Considerations, Legal Considerations, Demonstration - or excuse me, Demonstrator Tactics, Police Units and Tactics.
BERRY: That all sounds like it was maybe from the CMIC training.
GJOVIK: That's what I'm seeing here too.
BERRY: Yeah, yeah. Okay. Okay, yeah, I'm familiar with that training. Well, and this may be too broad of a question to ask, but before I move on to the third bullet point in this memo, that you're aware of have RRT members been given conflicting in inaccurate information during training sessions regarding authorized uses of force?
GJOVIK: I have no firsthand knowledge of that. I have heard that through previous Internal Affairs investigations.
BERRY: Okay. And when you talk about hearing about it through previous IA investigations, kind of like concerns that involved and witness members have raised during their interviews?
GJOVIK: That's correct.
BERRY: Okay. And are you able to kind of broadly - I'm putting you on the spot asking you to answer for previous IA investigations and we were talking about Training Division materials here, but before I move on are you able to broadly kind of characterize those concerns? Like what kind of things have officers said?
GJOVIK: Yeah, after looking at Section 9 of 0635.10 I believe that was the main crux of the issue is that they were saying that Section 9 superseded the requirement for, you know, objective reasonableness.
BERRY: Oh okay, so once the CMIC gives the go ahead for disperse and the use of RCAs, then that is the authorized use of force in a -
GJOVIK: That's my recollection of the issue. It's been a while since I've been involved in the case though.
BERRY: Absolutely. Absolutely. No, and I appreciate your forbearance there. All right, well let me just real fast read the third bullet point here. I've got a couple of questions about that. "The team feels changes in directive interpretation and changes in policy have been applied retroactively creating an environment where members acted within training, directive, and policy, but were later disciplined based on directive interpretation and policy changes that were not in place when the members' reviewed act took place." A very broad question, do you have any knowledge of what the policy changes are that Lieutenant Clark was referring to?
GJOVIK: I can't imagine. I'm looking at this policy and it doesn't look it has changed during the time of the protests. The only thing I can think of that he might be referring to is the multiple TROs and Executive Orders that came out addressing the TROs.
BERRY: Absolutely. Well, and I want to - yeah, let's jump ahead and address that now. I recall that City's - the City Attorney's Office put on a training session related to the TROs and some of the concerns raised in lawsuits. Is that the trainings that you were referring to?
GJOVIK: You know, quite frankly I don’t recall the -
BERRY: Very good.
GJOVIK: - (inaudible - 00:21:13) trainings.
BERRY: All right. Well, do you remember the thing that I'm talking about? The City Attorney put on a training session for the RRT. I think it was after the Hernandez and the newspaper lawsuit?
GJOVIK: Yes, there was guidance that was sent out via email the - like an Executive Order from the Chief, but I - yes, I remember some sort of training by the City Attorney. I was not privy to it, but I remember it being referenced in past cases.
BERRY: Yeah. Yeah. All right. Okay, so then I was asking if you were aware of any policy changes that Clark was referring to. You mentioned some Executive Orders that came out via email in response to TROs and stuff like that, and I jumped ahead to the City Attorneys. In terms of the Executive Orders - I asked you about policy changes

and you were referred to the Executive Orders. Beyond those can you think of any other policy changes that came out? Just the Executive Orders?
GJOVIK: No, the one I'm specifically thinking of is the Executive Order for the use of CS gas.
BERRY: Yeah.
GJOVIK: Sorry, I'm looking through my computer.
BERRY: No, no, I appreciate you looking around. I know that we're moving around a little bit right here too, so -
GJOVIK: That's the one I specifically remember. I don't remember any other policy changes.
BERRY: Okay. And so that was that order that kind of restricted the use of CS unless kind of more restrictive conditions were met during the course of a riot?
GJOVIK: Yeah.
BERRY: Okay. Excellent.
GJOVIK: Yeah, it basically made CS gas, yeah, it's an immediate risk of death or serious physical injury which cannot otherwise safely be addressed without greater application of force.
BERRY: That's right. And in that paragraph he also made a reference to changes in directive interpretation, and I'm just wondering if you have any knowledge of what changes he's referring to?
GJOVIK: I am not. I assume he's talking about that paragraph or that Section 9 in 0635.10, and those interpretation changes must have been made at a different level than mine 'cause I know in our office it was pretty clear that 0635.10 you had to be in policy with 1010.00 as well.
BERRY: Absolutely. Absolutely. All right. And one more question about that before we move on to another bullet point. Off the top of your head can you think of any particular incidents or protests or investigations that reflect some of those changes that Clark is talking about?
GJOVIK: Oh gosh, there was a handful of them. Give me a second.
BERRY: Yeah, yeah.
GJOVIK: Yeah, I mean, there was a half a dozen of them. I can't remember the involved members at this point if that's -
BERRY: Oh yeah, no, no, and that's a level of detail I don't expect you to be able to provide. So you got about a -
GJOVIK: Yeah, no (Crosstalk).
BERRY: - half a dozen cases maybe, and are they all - is it fair to say are they all relating to the use of riot control agents like CS and stuff?
GJOVIK: CS or less lethal munitions. Yeah, I think that's fair to say.
BERRY: All right. All right. Well, we're coming up on the last bullet point that I wanted to ask you about that memo. And it's bullet point number 13, "Throughout the demonstrations of 2020 and continuing until today members of RRT were repeatedly asked to develop various tactical solutions to various problems identified with the demonstrations. RRT repeatedly developed new tactics. Those tactics were approved and implemented, however in some cases those tactics approved by Bureau leadership were later criticized when Bureau leadership or Council, City Council I guess, did not like the outcome." Do you have any knowledge of what new tactics RRT implemented or what he's talking about there?
GJOVIK: Unfortunately I don't.
BERRY: Yeah. Do you have any knowledge of why - how these tactics - RRT tactics were criticized, the ones that they developed?
GJOVIK: I don't 'cause I don't what you're talking about (inaudible - 00:26:13) which tactics. Sorry.
BERRY: No, no. I realized about halfway through the question that's a difficult question to answer if you don't know what the tactics are. Do you have any kind of knowledge of whether these tactics were developed after the use of riot control agents was restricted? Do you think that's the time that we're talking about?
GJOVIK: So I'm making a huge assumption here, so I want to preface that.
BERRY: Excellent. I appreciate you clarifying.

GJOVIK: I would assume that after the restriction on November 30th requiring, you know, gas basically not be used that there had to have been a change in tactics and developed, you know, different strategies on how to move crowds and how to address situations like this. So, I assume that's what they're talking about.
BERRY: Well, and I appreciate you clarifying. So it doesn't sound like that's based on any firsthand knowledge of what the RRT was doing out there. It's just your assumption based on kind of the chronology of events?
GJOVIK: Right.
BERRY: Excellent. Thank you for that. So that was November 30th of 2021 that the use of CS was pretty severely restricted. Do I have the year right on that?
GJOVIK: So, that's when the -
BERRY: Or was it 2020?
GJOVIK: - Executive Order came out. There was direction given when the order from Mayor Wheeler came out on September 25th of 2020. So I guess it was codified an Executive Order on November 30th, but I remember emails coming out directing members not to use CS in September.
BERRY: I think I remember that email from the Mayor as well. Okay, so Mayor's email comes out kind of end of September 2020, about a year before you got to Training, and then the Executive Order is dated November 30th -
GJOVIK: Yeah.
BERRY: - of 2020. All right. So understanding that the change we are likely talking about happened about a year before you got to Training Division, does the Training Division have any kind of role in helping RRT develop new tactics?
GJOVIK: Well, if they were going to develop new tactics, and then train the rest of the team on those tactics, those individual tactics, yeah, they would require a lesson plan and, you know, the vetting process that's spelled out through Directive 1500.00. If it was just a, you know, a one-off like, "Hey, you know, we're doing this on the fly, develop a new tactic, figure this out and you're responsible for it," there's really nobody to train. You're just getting authorization to make sure that, you know, it's blessed by the Chief's Office and it's within our current policy.
BERRY: That makes sense. And then I think I've got the sense of what you're saying, but I just want to make sure I understand. So, say like if the RRT encounters a new kind of street dragon or a new like protestor device out there it doesn't sound like it's gonna be Training Division members that will help them figure out the specific actions that they're gonna take out in the field to defeat that device.
GJOVIK: That's accurate. Yeah, we do not - well we currently have two crowd control experts in our staff, but we did not at that time. The subject matter experts were the actual members of RRT who are out on the street.
BERRY: Okay.
GJOVIK: (Inaudible - 00:29:55).
BERRY: So they'll develop the specific tactics, and then you've kind of described the Training Division's responsibility for helping with the lesson plan and ensuring that the training is properly approved, and kind of -
GJOVIK: Correct.
BERRY: - up the chain of command. Okay. Thank you for that. Do you have a sense of who - or I guess let me start a little broader. If RRT develops a new tactic like that is there gonna be a hands-on training session about it, like how the new tactic should be implemented?
GJOVIK: So I would guess - or I would say it completely depends. If it's a single person tactic or a two-person tactic there's not gonna be a training event 'cause those two people are just learning amongst the two of them, right?
BERRY: Yeah.
GJOVIK: If it's a full team tactic, you know, there - you know, everybody's gonna train on it. Yeah, depending on the exigency of having to use it, yes, there would be a training to get everybody up to speed, but I can tell you there's a caveat in the Directive 1500.00 that I - that the Training captain can authorize, you know, going under those 60 days and approving training at any time if there's a necessity to do so.
BERRY: Like (inaudible - 00:31:27).
GJOVIK: (Crosstalk) there would have been a necessity to do so because they were changing tactics nightly.

BERRY: That makes sense. All right. And just to clarify, I understand you weren't there at the time. Do you have any information about what Training Division specifically did regarding these new tactics that were done?
GJOVIK: I don’t.
BERRY: Yeah, all right. I think you've been clear. I just wanted to clarify. All right. Well, I started to ask you earlier about the City Attorney training sessions. I just want to return to that before we get you out of here. Now I've identified a kind of a - it was an online training session that the City Attorney gave following a number - or I think two temporary restraining orders, and some other associated lawsuits.
GJOVIK: Yes. Was that based on less lethal operations?
BERRY: It's where they had like -
GJOVIK: Yeah, I actually attended that.
BERRY: Okay, yeah, yeah. Yeah, I viewed it after the fact. So okay, yeah, that's the training that I'm talking about where they had like video and stills from different incidents and kind of specific comments about specific incidents. Do you have any idea did Training Division assist the City Attorney in preparing that training?
GJOVIK: I don't know that.
BERRY: You don’t know? Yeah.
GJOVIK: So, I know that the City Attorney didn’t used to submit lesson plans. That was just an inside the Bureau deal. Now they do. We're trying to tighten that up so just any City entity will have to -
BERRY: Have to do that.
GJOVIK: - submit lesson plans, BHR, City Attorney, anything like that.
BERRY: If you're comfortable speculating a bit do you have a sense at that time of whether the City Attorney was likely submitting lesson plans?
GJOVIK: Yeah, I don’t.
BERRY: Just don’t know?
GJOVIK: Yeah, I don’t have an answer. No, sorry.
BERRY: Well, and a kind of an associated question that came up with this, I was thinking about that, is that - I mean if the City Attorney presents a lesson plan or details of a training is that information - is that attorney-client privileged information?
GJOVIK: It's a great question. I don’t think so.
BERRY: I could ask an attorney I suppose.
GJOVIK: Yeah, that's a great question. When you find out the answer would you let me know?
BERRY: I'll let you know. I'll loop back.
GJOVIK: Yeah, I don't know. I just don’t know.
BERRY: All right. Well, so having attended the session yourself that you're aware of did any information in that City Attorney presentation conflict with other trainings the Bureau has given officers about the use of force?
GJOVIK: About the use of force? Not -
BERRY: Yeah.
GJOVIK: - that I know of or not that I can remember. Unfortunately I wasn't involved in the other RRT trainings that they may have received conflicting information of, but the information that I remember hearing on that Zoom training was consistent.
BERRY: Okay. And you clarified about conflicting information about the use of force. Kind of more broadly did that City Attorney's training present any other information that conflicted with other trainings that the Bureau has given?
GJOVIK: Not that I recall.
BERRY: Okay. Let's see, well and this is a - we're at the opening steps of this investigation and I'm still trying to get a sense of some potential witnesses. Can you think of other Training Division members who took part in developing training material or giving trainings to the RRT at that time, the spring and summer and fall of 2020?
GJOVIK: I would say the two best contacts would be Commander CRAIG DOBSON and Lieutenant FRANZ SCHOENING and obviously Lieutenant CLARK.

BERRY: And CLARK. Yeah. All right. And I know I've attended RRT trainings by both DOBSON and SCHOENING. Is it fair to say - much earlier in this interview you talked on - you had mentioned subject matter experts - specialized units having subject matter experts. It sounds like are those the subject matter experts for RRT, DOBSON AND SCHOENING and CLARK?
GJOVIK: Yes, and I believe Officer JOHN YOUNG -
BERRY: JOHN YOUNG.
GJOVIK: - was also involved in their less lethal program. So, he might be a good person to ask.
BERRY: All right. And then how about Training Division folks? Anyone in the Division that you're aware of from back then that did trainings?
GJOVIK: Not crowd control training. We do have a person that's in charge of the special weapons group, so AR-15, all the less lethals, that type of thing. His name was Officer BRANDON COX.
BERRY: Oh okay.
GJOVIK: But I don't believe at that point he had any information about grenadiers in his lesson plans, but I can't promise you that.
BERRY: Fair enough. Fair enough. No, I appreciate that. And then kind of more broadly hoping you might be able to help me out, can you think of other people who might have good information related to the development of crowd control training material for the Bureau?
GJOVIK: Oh.
BERRY: Anyone, anywhere.
GJOVIK: No, I mean, the CMICs were probably involved, so Captain CROOKER, Commander ROBINSON, possibly Commander JONES. Yeah, that'd be about it. I can't remember who - maybe Lieutenant RICK STAINBROOK was on the team then.
BERRY: Yeah, I can't remember for sure either. I've seen his name on different IAPs and stuff like that. That's for sure. All right. Well, beyond that we've kind of come up to the end of the questions I had hoped to ask you. Is there anything you want to add to our conversation or anything that seems important that we haven't talked about?
GJOVIK: No, I just wish I could have helped you more. I don't have a whole lot of context about what happened back then.
BERRY: No, well I really - a lot of the information you provided today is really useful. It kind of helps me better understand how the Training Division operates, and that in and of itself will be a big help for finding additional material. So, I appreciate your time today. Thank you very much.
GJOVIK: You bet. Thank you.
BERRY: Excellent. Sergeant KONCZAL is there anything you'd like to ask or clarify while we're still rolling?
KONCZAL: No, I'm good.
BERRY: Excellent. All right. Well, I'm gonna go ahead and quit recording. Time is approximately 8:41. Thank you.