



CIVILIAN POLICE REVIEW BOARD

May 12th, 2026

MEETING MINUTES

CIVILIAN POLICE REVIEW BOARD

MEMBERS

Brandon Brown, Chair
Diana Cyganovich
David Gatian
Chenoa Miller
Edwin Moore
Glenn Parker III
Billy Sharp
Waverly Willis

OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS

Michael Hess, Interim Administrator
Jessyca Watson, Interim General Manager
Art Bowker, Senior Investigator
Adam Eisen, Investigator
Allison Davis, Investigator
LJ Green, Investigator
Tammi Lampkin, Investigator
Kevin Wynne, Investigator
Alayne Koenig, Investigator

LEGAL COUNSEL

Dalya Oprian, Asst. Director of Law

MEETING AGENDA

I. **Call to Order** **Brandon Brown, Chair**

YouTube Timestamp: Not captured due to connection issues

1. Chair Brown called May 12, 2026 hearing to order at 9:23 am EST.
2. Roll Call
 - a. Vice Chair Kenneth Mountcastle had an excused absence
 - b. Member Gatian arrived to meeting after roll call @ 10:28 am EST.
 - c. A quorum was present.

II. **Approval of Minutes** **CPRB**

YouTube Timestamp: Not captured due to connection issues

1. **April 14th Meeting Minutes – In- person| City Hall**

Motion: Approve April 14th, 2026 CPRB Meeting Minutes pending the discussed edits.

Motion By: Sharp

Second By: Moore



Motion Status: Carried

2. April 20th Meeting Minutes – Virtual

Motion: Approve April 20th, 2026 CPRB Meeting Minutes

Motion By: Sharp

Second By: Moore

Motion Status: Carried

3. May 4th Meeting Minutes – Virtual

Motion: Approve May 4th, 2026 CPRB Meeting Minutes

Motion By: Sharp

Second By: Moore

Motion Status: Carried

III. Public Comment

Brandon Brown, Chair

YouTube Timestamp: Not captured due to connection issues

1. No individuals were present for Public Comment

**IV. Presentation of Investigations with Citizen
Or CDP Subject Employee Present**

Michael Hess

Interim Administrator

YouTube Timestamp: Not captured due to connection issues

1. No individuals were present for their case presentation

V. Presentation of Investigations

Michael Hess

Interim Administrator

OPS2024-0190

Timestamp: Not captured due to connection issues

Complainant: Chris Hoffman

Presented by: Bowker

Det. Donald Kopchak, #2139

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/ Conduct - **SUSTAINED**

Allegation B: Biased Policing - **SUSTAINED**

Allegation C: Other: Criminal Conviction - **SUSTAINED**



Case Update: In OPS Case 2024-0190, in which the CPRB previously sustained multiple Group Level III violations, including discrimination and biased policing findings that carry a presumption of termination. The officer has since resigned (04/29/2026). It was clarified that under the bargaining agreement, an officer who resigns while facing a scheduled disciplinary hearing cannot be rehired. Board members also asked whether the Board’s sustained findings would remain in the officer’s file. Investigator Bowker explained that while the officer has resigned, the findings remain in OPS records and, because the case was sent to Case Prep, the documentation should also be included in the officer’s personnel file. Staff will confirm this placement.

OPS2024-0020

Timestamp: 01:05 – 6:32

Complainant: Janelle Motley

Presented by: Bowker

P.O. Bryan Peters, # 1300

Det. Anne Reynolds, #1236

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation B: Improper Procedure

Allegation B: Improper Procedure

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Janelle Motley, who alleged Unprofessional Conduct and Improper Procedure by P.O. Bryan Peters and P.O. Anne Reynolds during their response to a domestic violence incident on January 24, 2024. Ms. Motley stated that the officers spoke to her disrespectfully, refused to call a supervisor when she requested one, threw down her driveway reflector, and failed to provide their names or badge numbers. She also reported that the officers did not handle the situation appropriately when detaining her.

OPS reviewed body-worn camera footage from both officers, the CDP incident report, and the complainant’s recorded interview. The WCS showed that officers responded to a domestic violence call involving Ms. Motley and her teenage daughter, who had fled the home in fear. The footage documented officers locating both individuals, attempting to speak with Ms. Motley, and detaining her after she refused to comply with their instructions. WCS confirmed that an officer did place the driveway reflector on the ground after requesting control of it, consistent with safety and scene management. The footage also showed that Ms. Motley was offered the option to have a supervisor respond, and she declined. WCS did not show her requesting the officers’ names or badge numbers, nor did it show any disrespectful or discourteous behavior by the officers. Their conduct was consistent with Manual Rule 5.09 regarding courtesy and respectful behavior.

OPS recommended Unfounded for Allegation A, Unprofessional Conduct, concluding that the alleged behavior did not occur based on the WCS evidence. OPS also recommended



Unfounded for Allegation B, Improper Procedure, as the officers' actions were consistent with CDP policy and the preponderance of the evidence did not support the complainant's claims.

Board Discussion Summary: There were no further questions, comments, or concerns after the case presentation.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Bryan Peters, #1300 Det. Anne Reynolds, #1236	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Willis Second by: Parker III Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Improper Procedure

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Bryan Peters, #1300 Det. Anne Reynolds, #1236	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Willis Second by: Parker III Motion Status: Carried

OPS2024-0069

Timestamp: 06:41 – 11:45

Complainant: Abdullah Alrwashdeh

Presented by: Bowker

P.O. Justin Thompson, #362

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Abdullah Alrwashdeh, who alleged Lack of Service by P.O. Justin Thompson during the response to the theft of his vehicle on March 25, 2024. Mr. Alrwashdeh stated that while officers were still on scene, he received a real time credit card alert showing attempted fraudulent use of a card taken during the theft. He believed officers should have taken immediate action—such as notifying dispatch or responding to the location—which he felt could have led to faster recovery of his vehicle. He reported that officers were dismissive and told him that detectives would follow up.



OPS reviewed body-worn camera footage from the responding officers, the complainant’s recorded statement, and investigative follow-up documentation. WCS showed that officers ensured the safety of the complainant’s wife, gathered all necessary information, and advised that the vehicle would be entered as stolen once the report was completed. When informed of the attempted credit card use, Officer Thompson advised canceling the card and explained that detectives would handle follow-up. The evidence showed that the case was referred to the 2nd District Detective Bureau the same day, and detectives conducted a full follow-up investigation, including reviewing surveillance footage, seeking public assistance, identifying suspects, and filing charges. OPS determined that patrol officers fulfilled their responsibilities under Manual Rules 1.08 and 9.05 by completing the initial report, securing the scene, and forwarding the case for investigative follow-up.

OPS recommended Exonerated for Allegation A, Lack of Service, concluding that Officer Thompson’s actions were consistent with CDP policy and the division of responsibilities between patrol officers and detectives.

Board Discussion Summary: There were no further questions, comments, or concerns after the case presentation.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Justin Thompson, #362	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in CDP Manual Rules 1.08 and 9.05.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Parker III Motion Status: Carried

OPS2024-0102

Timestamp: 11:50 – 22:43

Complainant: Theresa Pendergrass

Presented by: Green

Sgt. Michael Bechtold, #9267

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation C: Missing Property

P.O. Justin Longstreet, #2061

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation C: Missing Property

P.O. Michael Crane, #2108

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

P.O. Xavier Lynch, #730

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service



Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct
Allegation C: Missing Property

P.O. Angelia Gatson, #2294

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service
Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct
Allegation C: Missing Property

P.O. Braden Jarrell, #2076

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service
Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct
Allegation C: Missing Property

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct
Allegation C: Missing Property

P.O. David Myers, #2297

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service
Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct
Allegation C: Missing Property

P.O. Paul Raddell, #1160

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service
Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct
Allegation C: Missing Property

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Teresa Pendergrass, who alleged Lack of Service, Unprofessional Conduct, and Missing Property by multiple Cleveland Division of Police officers responding to her residence on May 4, 2024. Officers were dispatched after her son reported that an individual inside the home was threatening self-harm with a firearm. Ms. Pendergrass stated that officers entered her residence without permission, behaved unprofessionally, and allowed the victim's sisters to enter the home and remove property. She further alleged that after officers left, she discovered \$500 in cash missing from under her mattress and personal belongings belonging to her son Ricardo missing from the home.

OPS reviewed extensive body-worn camera footage from all responding officers, along with incident reports and a nonrecorded interview with Ms. Pendergrass. The WCS showed officers deescalating a suicidal individual in the hallway of the apartment complex and directing Ms. Pendergrass to step away from the scene for safety. Footage documented that officers remained primarily in the front area of the residence while the victim's sisters removed his belongings. At one point, when Ricardo identified a tote bag as his property, the women immediately returned it. WCS did not show officers entering the home without lawful purpose, behaving unprofessionally, or participating in or facilitating the removal of property beyond what the victim's family retrieved. No evidence corroborated the allegation that officers took or mishandled money or personal items. The responding officers' actions were consistent with Manual Rules 4.03, 4.18, 5.02, 5.08, and 5.09, as well as GPO 5.11.03 governing Crisis Intervention Team responses.

OPS recommended Unfounded for Allegation A, Lack of Service, concluding that officers responded appropriately, ensured safety, and facilitated the safe transfer of property while arranging medical transport for the victim. OPS recommended Unfounded for Allegation B, Unprofessional Conduct, as WCS showed no discourteous or inappropriate behavior. OPS recommended Insufficient Evidence for Allegation C, Missing Property, as the investigation could not establish whether the alleged loss occurred or whether any officer was involved.



Board Discussion Summary: The Board discussed the complainant’s allegation that officers took five hundred dollars from her bedroom during their response. Investigator Green explained that the complainant declined a recorded interview but stated during her in-person conversation that the money had been kept under her mattress in a bedroom located at the rear of the home. Green noted that the wearable camera footage showed all officers remained at the front of the residence for the duration of the incident and did not enter the back rooms. She initially considered an “insufficient evidence” finding but, after consulting with a senior investigator, concluded that the allegation should be unfounded because the video evidence did not show any officer entering the area where the money was allegedly taken. Board members agreed that the analysis was appropriate and that the available evidence supported an unfounded finding.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
Sgt. Michael Bechtold, #9267 P.O. Michael Crane, #2108 P.O. Angelia Gatson, #2294 P.O. Braden Jarrell, # 2076 P.O. Justin Longstreet, #2061 P.O. Xavier Lynch, #730 P.O. David Meyers, #2297 P.O. Paul Raddell, #1160	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
Sgt. Michael Bechtold, #9267 P.O. Michael Crane, #2108 P.O. Angelia Gatson, #2294 P.O. Braden Jarrell, # 2076 P.O. Justin Longstreet, #2061 P.O. Xavier Lynch, #730 P.O. David Meyers, #2297 P.O. Paul Raddell, #1160	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

Allegation C: Missing Property

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
---------	-----------	--------



Sgt. Michael Bechtold, #9267 P.O. Michael Crane, #2108 P.O. Angelia Gatson, #2294 P.O. Braden Jarrell, # 2076 P.O. Justin Longstreet, #2061 P.O. Xavier Lynch, #730 P.O. David Meyers, #2297 P.O. Paul Raddell, #1160	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried
--	--	--

OPS2024-0134

Timestamp: 22:48 –37:05

Complainant: A’Lexis Prettyman

Presented by: Eisen

Det. Bobby Sumlin, #2153

Allegation A: Biased Policing

Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Citation

Allegation C: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by A’Lexis Prettyman, who alleged Bias Policing, Improper Procedure, and Unprofessional Conduct by Detective Bobby Sumlin during an encounter on June 11, 2024. Ms. Prettyman reported that while walking her dog, the animal defecated on Saint Martin de Porres High School property. She stated that Det. Sumlin yelled at her about failing to pick up the waste, followed her to her residence, and later followed her again when she drove past the school. She further alleged that he improperly issued citations by mail and that his conduct was biased and unprofessional.

OPS reviewed body-worn camera footage, court summonses, traffic and misdemeanor citations, and conducted interviews with the complainant, a school administrator, and Det. Sumlin. The evidence showed that Det. Sumlin, working as a school security officer, observed Ms. Prettyman commit multiple ordinance violations, including failing to dispose of dog waste and operating a vehicle with expired plates. Both parties acknowledged that he yelled from a significant distance, which OPS determined was consistent with attempting to communicate across space rather than unprofessional conduct. OPS found no evidence that his enforcement actions were motivated by bias; instead, they were based on observed violations. However, OPS determined that Det. Sumlin did not follow required CDP procedures for issuing citations. He mailed summonses instead of personally serving a Uniform Traffic Ticket, did not document a valid reason for issuing a summons in lieu of a UTT, and failed to include the required subsection for the Driving Under Suspension charge. These omissions were inconsistent with GPO 8.2.03, GPO 3.4.06, and GPO 3.4.14.

OPS recommended Exonerated for Allegation A, Bias Policing, concluding that the enforcement actions were based on observed conduct and consistent with GPO 1.07.08. OPS



recommended Sustained for Allegation B, Improper Procedure, finding that the detective's citation process did not comply with CDP policy or Ohio law. OPS recommended Exonerated for Allegation C, Unprofessional Conduct, determining that his raised voice was due to distance and that his conduct remained within professional expectations.

***Investigator Addendum (March 26, 2026):** OPS noted that Det. Sumlin's WCS had been deleted under CDP's retention policy, but the footage had been reviewed and summarized in the original investigation. No new information altered the findings, and the original recommendations remain unchanged.*

Board Discussion Summary: The Board discussed several questions regarding the officer's employment status at the time of the incident and whether he was acting as a CDP officer or as a security guard for a local high school. Members noted that the officer's statement indicated he was employed at the school, but it was unclear whether he was working in his capacity as a police officer during the encounter. The Board examined whether or not an officer can issue a citation while off duty and concluded that officers are legally permitted to issue tickets even when not on duty, although they are not required to do so. Members also considered whether the presence of wearable camera footage suggested he was on duty but clarified that officers are not required to wear WCS during secondary employment, leaving the question unresolved.

The Board then turned to concerns about multiple interactions between the officer and the complainant, including an alleged encounter at the high school where the complainant reported that the officer told her to "wait until I get off work." Members questioned whether this interaction had been addressed during the officer's interview and whether any body-worn camera footage existed. The investigator explained that the available WCS footage only covered the initial ordinance related interaction and that the later encounter described by the complainant did not appear to have been explored during the interview. Board members expressed concern that this additional interaction, and the alleged comment, could be central to understanding the complainant's motivation for filing the complaint.

Several members stated that the Board should not move forward without clarifying whether the alleged school-based interaction occurred and whether the officer was asked about it. They emphasized the importance of giving the officer an opportunity to respond directly to the allegation, noting that his explanation could meaningfully affect the Board's assessment. The Board agreed that the lack of inquiry into this third interaction represented an incomplete investigative record and that further follow-up was necessary. Members reached consensus that the case should be tabled to allow OPS to obtain clarification from the officer regarding the alleged additional encounter and the comment attributed to him.

Motion: Tabled case for OPS needs to further investigate specifically regarding the interaction between the complainant A'Lexis Prettyman and Det. Bobby Sumlin at Saint Martin de Porres High School to review the alleged comments Det. Sumlin made to the complainant.

Motion: Chair Brown

Second: Miller



Motion Status: Carried

OPS2024-0157

Timestamp: 37:20 – 41:01

Complainant: Vevackia Garner

Presented by: Eisen

P.O. Samuel Ortiz, #102

P.O. John Marincek, #1775

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Vevackia Garner, who alleged Lack of Service by P.O. John Marincek and P.O. Samuel Ortiz during their response to her call for assistance on July 7, 2024. Ms. Garner reported that she “felt like she had to beg for a report” and believed officers were dismissive of her concerns about a neighbor stealing water and threatening her. She stated that she repeatedly asked for a police report and felt the officers were not taking her seriously.

OPS reviewed body-worn camera footage from both officers, the complainant’s recorded interview, and the completed incident report. The WCS showed P.O. Marincek walking through the residence with Ms. Garner, asking clarifying questions, and gathering information needed to complete her report. The footage documented Ms. Garner requesting a report multiple times, and each time P.O. Marincek confirmed that he would provide one. He ultimately issued her report (2024195295) and provided her with a victim’s rights packet. The WCS also captured Ms. Garner reporting threats made against her, which P.O. Marincek documented. The footage did not show P.O. Ortiz interacting with Ms. Garner; he remained outside near the patrol vehicle throughout the encounter.

During her OPS interview, Ms. Garner stated that she wished to withdraw her complaint and declined to answer further questions. OPS determined that P.O. Marincek fulfilled his responsibilities under Manual Rule 4.18 by investigating the matter and completing the required report. Because P.O. Ortiz had no interaction with the complainant, OPS found no basis for the allegation against him.

OPS recommended Exonerated for Allegation A, Lack of Service, against P.O. Marincek, concluding that he completed the report and acted in accordance with CDP policy. OPS recommended Unfounded for Allegation A against P.O. Ortiz, as the WCS showed he did not engage with the complainant and therefore could not have committed the alleged conduct.

Board Discussion Summary: There were no further questions, comments, or concerns after the case presentation.

Case Findings:



Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Samuel Ortiz, #102	<i>Unfounded- The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried
P.O. John Marincek, #1775	<i>Exonerated - The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in CDP Manual Rule 4.18.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

OPS2024-0162

Timestamp: 40:57 – 44:31

Complainant: Terry Austin

Presented by: Bowker

Det. Tony Gonzalez, #112

Allegation A: Property Damage

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Terry Austin, who alleged Property Damage by Detective Tony Gonzalez following his arrest on August 26, 2022. Mr. Austin stated that after he was taken into custody in connection with a homicide investigation, his vehicle was towed for processing and later returned with significant damage, including to the front driver side wheel well, glove compartment, and passenger side door. He believed the damage occurred while the vehicle was in police custody and attributed it to improper handling by law enforcement.

OPS reviewed body-worn camera footage from the date of the arrest, the tow supplement, and related documentation. The WCS showed Detective Gonzalez conducting a full 360degree walkaround of the vehicle at the scene, documenting all visible damage before the tow. The tow supplement listed the reason for the tow, processing for homicide evidence, and included the same preexisting damage noted on video. The footage confirmed that dents, a missing mirror, and door damage were already present at the time of the arrest. No evidence indicated that additional damage occurred while the vehicle was in CDP custody or during processing at the coroner’s office. OPS determined that Detective Gonzalez complied with GPO 6.03.01 (Vehicle Tow and Release) and GPO 6.03.02 (Vehicle Processing), both of which require officers to document vehicle condition prior to towing.

OPS recommended Unfounded for Allegation A, Property Damage, concluding that the alleged conduct did not occur and that the officer properly documented all pre-existing damage in accordance with CDP policy.



Board Discussion Summary: There were no further questions, comments, or concerns after case presentation.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Property: Damage

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
Det. Tony Gonzalez, #112	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Cyganovich Second by: Parker II Motion Status: Carried

OPS2024-0285

Timestamp: 44:34 – 51:29

Complainant: Derek Estvaik

Presented by: Green

P.O. Samuel Ortiz, #102

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation B: Biased Policing

Allegation C: Lack of Service: No Service

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Derek Estvaik, who alleged Unprofessional Conduct, Biased Policing, and Lack of Service by P.O. Samuel Ortiz during a three car motor vehicle accident response on November 6, 2024. Mr. Estvaik stated that Officer Ortiz displayed bias by speaking Spanish to the Hispanic male he believed caused the accident and that the crash report took nine weeks to arrive. He also asserted that Officer Ortiz failed to properly evaluate the cause of the crash and favored the other driver.

OPS reviewed body-worn camera footage, the complainant’s interview, and the OH1 crash report. The WCS showed Officer Ortiz arriving on scene with other CDP and CFD personnel, gathering statements from the involved drivers, and issuing the OH1 report number. The footage documented that the driver of Unit 1 explained he struck a trailer protruding into the roadway, which caused him to collide with Mr. Estvaik’s vehicle. Mr. Estvaik provided a similar account, stating he was driving into the sun when the SUV struck the trailer and then hit his vehicle. Officer Ortiz facilitated a tow for Unit 1 and offered to follow Mr. Estvaik to his business for safety when he declined a tow.

The WCS also captured a conversation between Officer Ortiz and the tow truck driver, Xavier, which transitioned from English to Spanish. OPS obtained a certified translation of the Spanish language portion of the conversation. The translator confirmed that the discussion



contained no biased or case related content and consisted only of unrelated small talk. OPS also confirmed that the OH1 crash report was uploaded to the state system on December 5, 2024, less than one month after the incident.

OPS found no evidence that Officer Ortiz acted unprofessionally, displayed bias, or failed to provide service. His actions were consistent with GPO 1.07.08 (Bias-Free Policing), GPO 8.01.02 (Traffic Accident Reports), and Manual Rule 3.12.

OPS recommended Unfounded for Allegation A, Unprofessional Conduct, concluding that the alleged behavior did not occur. OPS recommended Unfounded for Allegation B, Biased Policing, as the Spanish language conversation was unrelated to the incident and showed no bias. OPS recommended Unfounded for Allegation C, Lack of Service, determining that Officer Ortiz completed all required duties, provided the crash report number, and ensured the safety of the involved parties.

Board Discussion Summary: The Board’s discussion on this case was brief and focused on an administrative issue rather than the substance of the complaint. A member noted that the complainant’s name appeared with two different spellings—one in the investigative report and another on the meeting agenda. The Board requested that the name be verified and corrected to ensure consistency across all case materials before proceeding with any motions or further action.

Additional Information to Note: Complainant name needs to reflect the correct name in the meeting minutes as listed on the investigative report. Correct spelling of last name is Estvaik.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Samuel Ortiz, #102	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Biased Policing

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Samuel Ortiz, #102	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in General Police Order 1.07.08.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried



Allegation C: Lack of Service: No Service

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Samuel Ortiz, #102	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

OPS2024-0288

Timestamp: 52:27 – 56:56

Complainant: Catherine Toth

Presented by: Lampkin

P.O. Michael Coleman, #477

P.O. Jason Santana, #2012

Allegation A: Biased Policing

Allegation A: Biased Policing

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Catherine Toth, who alleged Bias Policing by P.O. Michael Coleman and P.O. Jason Santana during their response to her call for service on November 18, 2024. Ms. Toth reported that her neighbors and their landscapers were blowing leaves toward her property, yelling at her, and violating a protection order she believed was in place. She stated that the officers were biased because they did not tell her what her neighbors said during their conversation, while she believed the neighbors were given more information and courtesy. She also described her neighbors as homophobic and racist and believed the officers favored them.

OPS reviewed body-worn camera footage from both officers, the police report, and the complainant’s statements. The WCS showed that P.O. Santana spoke with the landscapers and the neighbor to gather their account of the incident, then spoke with Ms. Toth to hear her concerns. He requested a copy of the protection order, explained the reporting process, and provided information on how to follow up with the prosecutor. WCS also showed that Channel 9 confirmed no valid protection order was active at the time. Both officers remained calm, professional, and courteous throughout the interaction.

The footage documented that Ms. Toth requested that P.O. Coleman come over and tell her what he had discussed with the neighbor. P.O. Coleman declined, stating that the conversation was not her business. OPS determined that officers are not required to relay all details of their conversations with other parties, and declining to do so does not constitute bias. The WCS showed no discriminatory language, behavior, or differential treatment based on any protected characteristic. Both officers attempted to mediate the situation and ensure a peaceful resolution.



OPS recommended Unfounded for Allegation A, Bias Policing, against both P.O. Coleman and P.O. Santana, concluding that the alleged conduct did not occur and that both officers acted in accordance with GPO 1.07.08.

Board Discussion Summary: There were no further questions, comments, or concerns after the case presentation.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Biased Policing

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Michael Coleman, #477 P.O. Jason Santana, #2012	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

OPS2024-0299

Timestamp: 57:00 – 1:04:47

Complainant: Stephanie Chessnut

Presented by: Eisen

Sgt. Teresa Gomez, #9135

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

Allegation B: Missing Property

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Stephanie Chestnut, who alleged Lack of Service and Missing Property by Sgt. Teresa Gomez related to the investigation of her son’s homicide and the disposition of her son’s vehicle. Ms. Chestnut stated that she was not informed when the original detective retired, did not know who was assigned to the case, and was unaware that her son’s truck had been destroyed. She believed she should have been notified and given the opportunity to retrieve the vehicle before it was disposed of.

OPS reviewed the complaints, the incident report, and communications with the impound lot and the City of Cleveland Law Department. The evidence showed that the original detective, Det. Diaz, retired, and the case remained with detectives in his squad, including Det. Bauhof and Det. Gonzalez. Sgt. Gomez confirmed that she provided Ms. Chestnut with the name of the detective currently assigned to the case and that the homicide investigation remained active. Regarding the vehicle, OPS found that the truck had been stored for evidentiary processing and was later released. Records indicated that attempts were made to notify Ms. Chestnut, but she had been out of state for an extended period and did not retrieve the vehicle before the deadline. OPS was unable to obtain additional documentation from the impound lot or Law Department



confirming the exact timeline of notifications, but no evidence indicated misconduct by Sgt. Gomez.

OPS recommended Exonerated for Allegation A, Lack of Service, concluding that Sgt. Gomez provided the appropriate information regarding the assigned detective and acted in accordance with Manual Rule 4.18. OPS also recommended Exonerated for Allegation B, Missing Property, determining that the vehicle was lawfully processed and disposed of under ORC 2981.11, and that Sgt. Gomez’s actions were consistent with legal requirements.

Board Discussion Summary: The Board reviewed the OPS findings regarding the allegations against Sergeant Teresa Gomez. The investigator explained that OPS recommended exonerated findings for both allegations. For the lack of service allegation, OPS determined that the alleged conduct occurred but was consistent with Manual Rule 4.18. For the missing or damaged property allegation, OPS found that the alleged conduct occurred but was consistent with Ohio Revised Code 2981.11.

Board members asked several questions about the procedures for notifying vehicle owners once a vehicle is released from investigative status. The investigator explained that the city sends notice to the last known address on file, typically based on BMV records, and that in this case the complainant had left the state for several months, which contributed to her not receiving the notice. Members discussed the city’s practice of sending certified notices, the thirty day window before a vehicle may be scrapped due to lot capacity, and the distinction between notices sent to the vehicle owner versus the property owner. After these clarifications, the Board concluded its discussion without further questions for the investigator.

Additional Information to Note: The investigative report was approved by the former Interim OPS Administrator, and that although Michael Hess is referenced in the case facts due to his prior role as an Assistant Law Director, he did not participate in the review or investigation of this case in his current capacity as OPS Administrator. This clarification was added to ensure transparency for anyone reviewing the case materials.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
Sgt. Teresa Gomez, #9135	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Parker III Motion Status: Carried



	<i>occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in CDP Manual Rule 4.18.</i>	Abstention: Member Gatian- arrived after the case presentation
--	--	--

Allegation B: Missing Property

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
Sgt. Teresa Gomez, #9135	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in ORC §2981.11(A)I and ORC §2981.13.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Parker III Motion Status: Carried Abstention: Member Gatian- arrived after the case presentation

OPS2024-0301

Timestamp: 1:04:47 – 1:13:51

Complainant: Eileen Joyce

Presented by: Bowker

P.O. Johnathan Barker, #985

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Eileen Joyce, who alleged Lack of Service by P.O. Jonathan Barker after her company did not receive an OH-1 crash report in what she believed was a timely manner. The underlying incident occurred on November 21, 2024, when P.O. Barker and his partner responded to a three-vehicle crash on Interstate 90. No injuries were reported. The officers gathered information from all involved parties, ensured the scene was safe, and confirmed no one required medical attention. P.O. Barker completed the OH-1 crash report the same day.

Ms. Joyce filed her complaint on December 19, 2024, stating that she and her company had repeatedly contacted the district seeking the report and were told that the officer needed to finalize it. She believed the delay reflected inadequate service. During her OPS interview, she stated that she ultimately received the report, approximately one month after the incident, and no longer wished to pursue the complaint, but left the investigation to OPS.

OPS reviewed WCS from P.O. Crawford (Barker’s WCS battery was dead), the OH-1 report, and interviews with both the complainant and the officer. The evidence showed that P.O. Barker completed the report on November 21, 2024, and that the delay occurred during the administrative processing phase, which is outside the officer’s control. OPS confirmed that OH-1 reports typically take 2–3 weeks to appear on the Public Safety site and may take up to 6 weeks.



In this case, the report was finalized on December 20, 2024, four weeks after the incident, within the normal processing window. OPS found that P.O. Barker adhered to GPO 8.01.02 and Manual Rules 4.03 and 9.08 by completing the report promptly and giving full attention to his duties.

OPS recommended Unfounded for Allegation A, Lack of Service, concluding that the alleged conduct did not occur and that the officer provided appropriate service at the scene and completed the required documentation in a timely manner.

Board Discussion Summary: The Board discussed the complainant’s concern about the monthlong delay between the officer completing the crash report and the report becoming available in the system, which prevented her insurance company from processing her claim. A Board member asked the investigator to explain what typically occurs during that period and why a straightforward accident report would take so long to appear online. The investigator described the historical process in which officers completed hardcopy reports that were logged, reviewed by supervisors, and then forwarded downtown for additional review before being uploaded. He explained that the current electronic system is faster but still involves checks for accuracy, GPS coordinates, and completeness, and that delays can occur due to processing volume and internal review steps. He also clarified the difference between reports completed at the scene, which are forwarded to the Ohio Department of Public Safety, and walk-in reports filed at a district, which remain only with the Accident Records Unit. Board members noted that the delay did not appear to be caused by the officer and instead reflected systemic processing timelines. They also discussed whether citizens are informed about how long reports may take, with the investigator stating that officers typically advise that reports will not be available immediately but may not specify that processing can take several weeks. The Board concluded that the delay was procedural rather than officer related and had no further questions.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Jonathan Barker, #985	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in CDP Manual Rules 4.03, 9.08, and General Police Order 8.01.02.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Parker III Motion Status: Carried

OPS2024-0302

Timestamp: 1:13:54 – 1:19:36

Complainant: Diamond Gantt

Presented by: Bowker



Det. James Chrivel, #1727

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Diamond Gantt, who alleged Lack of Service by P.O. James Crivel in connection with the shooting of Dermille Woodland on May 30, 2024. Ms. Gantt stated that Mr. Woodland was shot by his ex-wife's son and that no arrest was made, which she believed reflected inadequate police work. She asserted that the officer should have arrested the individuals involved because Mr. Woodland had been hospitalized with a gunshot wound and his rental vehicle had been struck by multiple bullets.

OPS reviewed three body-worn camera recordings from P.O. Crivel, the complainant's interview, the police report, and the prosecutor's case disposition. The evidence showed that officers responded to two ShotSpotter alerts on Locke Avenue and later located Mr. Woodland's bullet damaged rental vehicle on Euclid Avenue. Mr. Woodland had already fled the scene and was later located at University Hospital. P.O. Crivel interviewed him there, obtained the names of the alleged shooters, and documented his account. He then conducted a follow-up investigation, including canvassing the area for evidence, knocking on doors, searching for casings or blood, and interviewing Ms. Nyeesha Woodland, who described a domestic violence history and stated she did not witness any gunfire. P.O. Crivel completed a felonious assault report listing Mr. Woodland as the victim and Ms. Woodland, her friend, and her son as suspects. He forwarded the case to the Cleveland Prosecutor's Office, which declined charges due to insufficient evidence.

OPS found that P.O. Crivel complied with GPO 5.08.04 and Manual Rules 4.18, 9.01, and 9.05 by conducting a thorough investigation, documenting all available information, and forwarding the case for prosecutorial review. The lack of arrest resulted from the prosecutor's determination—not from any failure by the officer.

OPS recommended Exonerated for Allegation A, Lack of Service, concluding that the officer's actions were consistent with CDP policy, training, and investigative procedures.

Board Discussion Summary: The Board's discussion focused on whether the complaint and the underlying incident fell within the six-month window relevant to discipline. Members noted that the incident occurred on May 30 and the complaint was filed in December, placing it outside the six--month period established- by the collective bargaining agreement for imposing discipline. The investigator confirmed that while the complaint was filed within OPS's intake requirements, the disciplinary clock is measured from the date of the incident, not from the date the complainant raised concerns about the investigation. Board members clarified that even if the Board were inclined to sustain an allegation, the timing would limit the available outcome. Because the incident was more than six months old, the only permissible action would be a letter of reinstruction rather than formal discipline. After confirming this procedural constraint, the Board concluded its discussion.



Additional Information to Note: Agenda correction, Senior Investigator Bowker stated the allegations was against P.O. Crivel, #1727 not P.O. Jonathan Barker, #985 as listed on the agenda.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
Det. James Crivel, #1727	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in CDP Manual Rule 5.01.</i>	Motion by: Cyganovich Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried

OPS2025-0263

Timestamp: 1:19:36 – 1:28:24

Complainant: Janelle Motley

Presented by: Koenig

P.O. James English III, #336

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/ Conduct

Allegation B: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Allegation C: WCS Violation

P.O. Cal Thomas, #1585

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/ Conduct

Allegation B: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Allegation C: WCS Violation

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Karen Brown, who alleged unprofessional behavior, lack of service, and a wearable camera system violation by P.O. James English III #336 and P.O. Cal Thomas #1585 during an incident at her residence on December 17, 2025. Ms. Brown reported that the officers used rude or racist language, threatened to handcuff or arrest her when she asked for a supervisor, failed to intervene when she was verbally threatened by another individual, and did not activate their wearable camera systems. These allegations were documented in the intake materials and her OPS interview.

OPS reviewed multiple sources of evidence, including four wearable camera system recordings from both officers, the complainant’s interview, the intake form, and the incident report. The footage showed that officers initially responded to a reported altercation between two juveniles, spoke with the involved parties, and cleared the scene after Ms. Brown stated everything was under control. When officers returned approximately twenty minutes later for a second disturbance, the footage documented Ms. Brown’s fiancé arguing with her daughter, the officers waiting for the daughter’s uncle to arrive, and Ms. Brown attempting to confront another female who had arrived at the home. The officers redirected Ms. Brown away from the doorway to prevent a physical altercation and attempted to maintain order as tensions escalated. The footage



did not capture any racist or rude comments, threats of arrest for requesting a supervisor, or any failure to activate wearable cameras.

Further evidence showed that when Ms. Brown requested a supervisor, P.O. Thomas contacted the Sergeant. The footage documented Ms. Brown yelling, stating that the officers were triggering her PTSD, and accusing them of not helping her, while the officers attempted to keep the peace and prevent further conflict. The officers stated that they did not hear any threats directed at Ms. Brown, and the footage did not show any such threats occurring in their presence. The officers' actions were consistent with Manual Rule 5.01 regarding conduct, Manual Rule 4.11 regarding the duty to act, and GPO 4.06.04 regarding wearable camera system activation.

OPS recommended that Allegation A, unprofessional behavior, be unfounded; Allegation B, lack of service, be unfounded; and Allegation C, wearable camera system violation, be unfounded. OPS concluded that the preponderance of the evidence, particularly the wearable camera system footage, did not support the complainant's allegations and showed that the officers' actions were consistent with CDP policy and expectations.

Board Discussion Summary: The Board asked the investigator to clarify the complainant's basis for alleging that the officers turned off their wearable camera systems. The investigator explained that Ms. Brown did not provide a specific rationale and simply stated that the officers must have turned the cameras off to avoid capturing what occurred, though the investigator noted that the footage did not show any point at which the cameras were deactivated. Board members also asked about the allegation that the officers made racist remarks. The investigator stated that Ms. Brown did not identify any specific language and only asserted generally that the officers were rude. According to the investigator, Ms. Brown described a situation in which she attempted to go outside to confront another individual, and the officers physically redirected her and spoke firmly in an effort to control the situation. The investigator noted that the wearable camera footage did not capture any racist remarks or unprofessional language. Board members emphasized the seriousness of allegations involving racist comments and sought confirmation that no specific terms or statements were provided. The investigator confirmed that no explicit remarks were identified by the complainant and none were heard on the footage. After these clarifications, the Board concluded its discussion.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. James English III, #363 P.O. Cal Thomas, #1585	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service



OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. James English III, #363 P.O. Cal Thomas, #1585	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

Allegation C: WCS Violation

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. James English III, #363 P.O. Cal Thomas, #1585	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

OPS2026-0012

Timestamp: 1:28:27 – 1:35:55

Complainant: Sally Davis

Presented by: Bowker

P.O. Robert Mason, #1980

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/ Conduct

Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Tow

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Sally Davis, who alleged unprofessional behavior and an improper tow procedure by P.O. Robert Mason #1980 during an interaction with her husband at their residence on January 9, 2026. Ms. Davis was not present during the encounter but reported that the officer cursed at her husband, harassed him, and improperly ordered their vehicle towed. These allegations were documented through her phone intake and supporting materials.

OPS reviewed the wearable camera system recordings from both P.O. Mason and P.O. Dale Beckman, along with the police report and tow documentation. The footage showed that P.O. Mason explained to Mr. Davis several times why the vehicle needed to be towed, including that it was blocking the sidewalk and that the issue originated from a 311 complaint. The footage also showed that P.O. Mason had previously given Mr. Davis additional days to move the vehicle and offered him more time on the date of the incident to arrange for someone to pick it up before the tow occurred. Mr. Davis acknowledged that the officer had given him extra time and stated, “You tried,” before the two parted ways. The interaction captured on video was calm, conversational, and free of any profanity, harassment, or unprofessional conduct.

Further evidence showed that the tow was consistent with General Police Order 6.03.01 and Cleveland Municipal Code 451.12. The wearable camera footage documented that P.O. Mason explained the process, allowed Mr. Davis time to make arrangements, and conducted the tow in



accordance with policy. The footage from both officers was consistent and did not support the complainant’s allegations.

OPS concluded that the officer’s actions were consistent with Manual of Rules Section 5.01 regarding conduct and with the procedural requirements governing vehicle tows. The investigation found no evidence that P.O. Mason engaged in unprofessional behavior or improperly ordered the tow. OPS recommended that Allegation A, unprofessional behavior, and Allegation B, improper procedure – tow, be unfounded based on the preponderance of the evidence, particularly the wearable camera system recordings.

Board Discussion Summary: The Board briefly discussed the context of the incident, noting that the tow originated from a 311 complaint rather than from discretionary officer action. A Board member emphasized that residents sometimes feel targeted or unfairly singled out when their vehicles are towed, particularly in residential neighborhoods, but explained that many of these situations begin with concerns raised by other community members. The Board observed that in this case the vehicle was parked on the sidewalk, obstructing the path for pedestrians, and that the officer’s response aligned with typical enforcement following a citizen-initiated complaint. No additional questions were raised for the investigator.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Robert Mason, #1980	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Willis Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Tow

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Robert Mason, #1980	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Willis Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

Meeting Recess:

Chair Brown called for a 5- minute meeting recess starting at 11:05 am EST.

Meeting Resumed Promptly at 11:10 am EST.



VI. Executive Session

CPRB

YouTube Timestamp: 1:35:48 – 4:26:41

- **Motion:** To enter executive session for personnel, Employment and discipline Matters will be considered. Inviting in OPS Interim Hess, General Manager Watson, and CPRB Legal Counsel Oprian.

Roll Call Vote: All Present Board Members said “Yes”.

Board Members: Brown, Cyganovich, Gatian, Miller, Moore, Parker II, Sharp, and Willis.

Motion Status: Carried

- Executive Session began at 11:12 am EST
- Adjourn back into open session at 2:03 pm EST

VII. OPS Status Report

Michael Hess

YouTube Timestamp: 4:27:08 – 4:30:07

Interim Administrator

A. OPS Cases & Administrative Update

In April, OPS received a total of 18 new complaints. No OPS cases were administratively dismissed, resulting in a net total of +18 cases for the month. Interim Admin Hess disclosed that the CPRB has 130 cases remaining for review and noted that the Board is making strong progress in reducing the case backlog.

Chair Brown reflected on the continued use of the OPS complaint system and noted that when residents keep filing complaints, it shows they still have some trust and hope in the police oversight process. He emphasized that even when broader community–police relations may feel strained, people’s willingness to use the system indicates they believe oversight can still work.

Chair Brown also addressed the number of abridged reports on the agenda and explained for the public why some cases move quickly during meetings. He noted that abridged reports are used when cases can be resolved primarily through clear wearable camera footage or when OPS cannot conduct a full investigation because complainants do not respond to follow-up attempts. When video evidence conclusively shows what occurred, or when allegations are contradicted by the footage, the Board may have limited deliberation during the meeting.

He stressed that the Board still thoroughly reviews each case file and all available footage before the meeting, and that a shorter public discussion does not mean the case



received less attention. Chair Brown emphasized that maintaining public trust requires ensuring complainants understand their cases are reviewed carefully and taken seriously.

VIII. Old Business

Brandon Brown, Chair

YouTube Timestamp: 4:30:07 – 4:40:13

A. OPS Administrator Search

Had 173 applications then narrowed it down to 2 applicants

- i. **Motion:** Hire Applicant ID:14455639 for the position of OPS Administrator based on the condition of pending background check and other HR processes; within the pay band of OPS Administrator.

Seconded By: Gatian

Opposed: Member Brown, Cyganovich, Sharp, Parker III

Motion Status: Failed

- ii. **Motion:** Hire Applicant ID: 39298844 for the position of OPS Administrator based on the condition of pending background check and other HR processes; within the pay band of OPS Administrator.

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Sharp

Motion Status: Carried

- iii. **Motion:** In the event Applicant ID: 39298844 does not accept the position we will then Hire Applicant ID: 14455639 for the position of OPS Administrator based on the condition of pending background check and other HR processes within the pay band of OPS Administrator.

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Moore

Motion Status: Carried

B. Additional OPS Staff Matters

No other additional OPS Staff members to report on

IX. New Business

Brandon Brown, Chair

YouTube Timestamp: 4:40:52 – 4:43:37

A. OPS Complainant System

The Board discussed how members of the public can file complaints against staff of the Office of Professional Standards, including investigators or the OPS Administrator. Chair Brown noted that personnel matters are typically handled in executive session, but the question raised required clarification of the appropriate public facing process. Board members considered how similar issues are handled in other city departments and agreed that OPS should follow a comparable structure.



They concluded that complaints about OPS staff should first be directed to the immediate supervisory chain, beginning with the Senior Investigator or General Manager, then to the OPS Administrator. If the matter cannot be resolved at those levels, it should be elevated to the Civilian Police Review Board as the ultimate managerial authority over OPS.

The Board also noted that the Office of the Inspector General is an additional resource available to the public for concerns related to public safety or police oversight functions. The discussion emphasized aligning OPS with standard city practices while ensuring clear avenues for community members to raise concerns about OPS personnel.

X. Public Comment **Brandon Brown, Chair**

YouTube Timestamp: 4:43:37 - 4:44:31

1. No individuals were present for Public Comment

XI. Adjournment **CPRB**

YouTube Timestamp: 4:44:31 – 4:44:53

Motion: To Adjourn May 12th, 2026 CPRB Meeting

Motion By: Sharp

Seconded By: Moore

Motion Status: Carried

- The CPRB May 12th, 2026 meeting was adjourned at 2:14 pm EST.
- The next CPRB Meeting will be held in-person at City Hall, Room 514 on June 9, 2026 at 9:15 a.m. EST.