



CIVILIAN POLICE REVIEW BOARD

September 4th, 2026

MEETING MINUTES

CIVILIAN POLICE REVIEW BOARD

MEMBERS

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

OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS

Jeff Wenninger, OPS Administrator
Jessyca Watson, General Manager
Art Bowker, Senior Investigator
Allison Davis, Investigator
LJ Green, Investigator

LEGAL COUNSEL

Dalya Oprian, Asst. Director of Law

SPECIAL VIRTUAL MEETING AGENDA

I. Call to Order

Brandon Brown, Chair

1. Chair Brown called September 4th, 2026, meeting to order at 11:01 a.m. EST.
2. Roll Call
 - a. A quorum was present.

II. Public Comment

Brandon Brown, Chair

- No individuals were present for public comment.

III. Presentation of Investigations (Part I)

Jeff Wenninger, OPS Administrator

OPS 2023-0195 Chief's Departure

Case overview: OPS Senior Investigator Art Bowker provided an overview of the case. The complaint involved conduct that occurred while Detective Taylor was working secondary employment at JACK Casino. Because he was working secondary employment, he was not required to wear WCS; however, JACK Casino provided video footage capturing portions of the incident.



During his OPS interview, Detective Taylor repeatedly stated that he did not remember the incident, even after being shown the available video. The Board determined that his failure to recall the incident, even when presented with evidence, constituted conduct unbecoming and a violation of divisional values. The CPRB sustained Allegation A: Excessive Force assigning a **Group II violation** for Failure to Take Accountability.

Chief's Review and Departure

A pre-disciplinary hearing was held on July 10, 2026. The Chief Director concluded, based on clear and convincing evidence, that Detective Taylor did not remember the incident due to the routine nature of his secondary-employment duties at JACK's Casino, where he frequently escorted patrons from the property. The Chief found that the incident did not stand out and that Taylor had no independent recollection of it.

The Chief further noted that Taylor's responses during the hearing appeared truthful and consistent with the volume of similar incidents he handled. Based on these findings, the Chief recommended **dismissal of Specification #2** and declined to impose discipline.

CBA Timeline Requirement

The Board was advised that a response to the Chief's departure must be issued by **September 4, 2026**, in accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement, due to the 90-day discipline-imposition window following issuance of the charge letter.

Board's Discussion Summary: The Board discussed the case involving Detective Daniel Taylor (#1090), focusing on the sustained allegation of Failure to Take Accountability. Chair Brown opened deliberations by reminding members of the officer's OPS interview, where Taylor repeatedly stated he did not remember the incident, even after being shown video footage. Brown emphasized that the Board's original concern was not merely memory lapse, but the officer's lack of cooperation during questioning. Member Gatian reiterated his previous dissenting position, stating he did not believe Taylor's inability to recall the incident constituted dishonesty, given the routine nature of his duties at JACK Casino.

Several Board members expressed differing views on whether the Chief's departure met the "clear and convincing evidence" standard. Member Sharp argued that the Chief failed to meet the required burden, noting that simply stating the officer did not remember did not constitute clear and convincing evidence. Member Miller echoed this sentiment, stating that "I don't remember" was not an adequate response when the officer was shown video of the incident. Investigator Bowker provided additional context from the Chief's hearing,



explaining that the union attorney questioned Taylor extensively about the routine nature of his job, and that Taylor did not witness the brick-throwing portion of the incident.

Motion: To reject the Chief's Departure, reaffirming the Board's original finding of sustained against Det. Taylor, Badge No. 1090 for Allegation D: Divisional Values. The Chief failed to demonstrate clear and convincing evidence for dismissal.

Motion By: Moore

Seconded By: Sharp

Opposed: Gatian – "I personally did not believe that was necessarily dishonest. I don't think that we can make rulings based on somebody saying I don't remember something."

Abstention: Cyganovich – Stepped away during case presentation and board's discussion to fix computer's audio issues.

Motion Status: Carried

Motion: Reduce the Group Level violation from Group II to a Group I, citing mitigating clarity provided during the Chief's hearing about the routine nature of the Det. Taylor's duties and the possibility of genuine memory lapse.

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Gatian

Opposed: Vice Chair Miller and Sharp - they believed the officer's repeated "I don't remember" responses—even when shown video evidence—were not adequate or cooperative, and therefore the seriousness of the sustained violation should remain at Group II. They also stated that the Chief failed to provide clear and convincing evidence to justify changing the Board's original classification, so lowering the group level would undermine the Board's prior decision.

Abstention: Cyganovich – Stepped away during case presentation and board's discussion to fix computer's audio issues.

Motion Status: Carried

Finally, the Board discussed the need to impose specific discipline due to CBA time constraints. Legal counsel confirmed that discipline must be included in the Board's response. The Board proceeded to consider discipline options consistent with Group I corrective actions (ranging from verbal counseling to a five-day suspension). The Board agreed to remain consistent with prior practice and impose discipline rather than leaving it unspecified.

Motion: Impose a "Letter of Reinstruction" to Det. Taylor, Badge No. 1090 as discipline following the guidelines of the disciplinary matrix under Group Level I violation.

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Sharp



Opposed: Gatian – Did not believe original allegation should be sustained; therefore, he does not concur with assigning any discipline.

Abstention: Cyganovich – Stepped away during case presentation and board’s discussion to fix computer’s audio issues.

Motion Status: Carried

IV. Executive Session

Brandon Brown, Chair

Motion: To enter Executive Session. Inviting in the Law Department, OPS Admin Wenninger, OPS General Manager Watson, and CPRB Administrative Assistant.

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Vice Chair Miller

Roll Call Vote – All board members said “Aye”

Motion Status: Carried

- Executive Session began at 11:46 a.m. EST.
- Open Session resumed at 1:08 p.m. EST.

V. Presentation of Investigations (Part II)

Jeff Wenninger, OPS Administrator

OPS 2024-0270 Chief’s Departure

Case overview: On August 24, 2024, officers responded to reports of Ceaerra Summers sitting in an incapacitated vehicle with two small children and appearing intoxicated. Officers Joshua Howe (#1190), Logan Weber (#2425), Russell May (#2129), and Sgt. Kevin Walker (#9234) arrived on scene. After Summers refused to identify herself, officers broke the passenger window to gain entry, removed her from the vehicle, arrested her, and transported her to Cleveland Clinic due to combative behavior. The complainant alleged excessive force, improper arrest, property damage, and unprofessional conduct. OPS reviewed 911 calls, WCS footage, medical records, and officer statements. The investigation concluded that the window break and arrest were justified, and that Officers Howe and May acted within policy. However, OPS found that Officer Weber used force that should have been reported and made unprofessional remarks toward Summers. OPS sustained Excessive Force and Unprofessional Conduct against Weber and added a Failure to Report Use of Force allegation on a February 2, 2026, addendum, determining that Weber violated GPO 2.01.05 by not submitting a required Use of Force report.

During the February 10 CPRB meeting, members reviewed the OPS investigation, WCS footage, medical documentation, and the OPS addendum. The Board separated its



analysis into two phases: the officers' initial response to the vehicle and the subsequent conduct at the hospital. Members agreed that the window break and removal of the children were justified and that Howe and May's on-scene actions aligned with CDP policy. The Board found no evidence supporting allegations of unprofessional conduct against Howe or May.

The Board expressed significant concern regarding Officer Weber's conduct at the hospital. Members noted the use of force applied after Summers was restrained to the hospital bed and the threatening, demeaning language captured on WCS. The Board determined that Weber's forehead pushes and arm manipulation were unnecessary and inconsistent with GPO 2.01.01 and Manual Rule 4.05. The Board sustained Excessive Force as a Group III violation and Unprofessional Conduct as a Group II violation. The Board also sustained Failure to Report Use of Force as a Group I violation, noting that Weber's omission of required documentation undermined accountability and violated GPO 2.01.05.

Chief's Review and Departure

The Chief Director of Public Safety reviewed OPS2024-0270 following the Civilian Police Review Board's sustained findings for Excessive Force, Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct, and Failure to Report Use of Force against Patrol Officer Logan Weber (#2425). The CPRB had classified the conduct as a Group III violation for Excessive Force, Group II for Unprofessional Conduct, and Group I for Failure to Report Use of Force.

A pre-disciplinary hearing was held on July 10, 2026. After reviewing the OPS investigation, WCS footage, witness statements, and relevant policies, the Chief Director issued a formal departure from the Board's finding for Specification #1 (Excessive Force). The Chief concluded that the CPRB's factual findings were contrary to clear and convincing evidence. According to the WCS footage, Ms. Summers—though handcuffed—was still able to move her arms and upper body, reach toward medical staff, and attempt to bite or spit, indicating she was not fully restrained or under control. The Chief determined that P.O. Weber's arm-control technique was neither forceful nor awkward and was consistent with maintaining safety in a medical setting. The Chief also found that Weber's contact with Ms. Summers' forehead occurred only after she attempted to bite or spit and was applied briefly as minimal force necessary to maintain control.



Applying these factual findings to policy, the Chief Director determined that P.O. Weber's actions were within the requirements of GPO 2.01.01 and Manual Rule 4.05 and did not constitute excessive or punitive force. The Chief therefore departed from the CPRB's recommendation and recommended dismissal of Specification #1.

The Chief requested a formal response from the Civilian Police Review Board by September 4, 2026, in accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement timelines.

CBA Timeline Requirement

The Board was advised that a response to the Chief's departure must be issued by **September 4, 2026**, in accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement, due to the 90-day discipline-imposition window following issuance of the charge letter.

Board's Discussion Summary: During deliberations on the Chief's Departure for OPS2024-0270, Chair Brandon Brown reopened the case by summarizing the Board's decision from February 2024, where CPRB sustained a Group Level 3 Excessive Force violation against Officer Logan Webber. Chair Brown reiterated that the Board's findings were based on the totality of circumstances, not solely on whether the complainant was physically restrained. He emphasized that the WCS footage showed Officer Webber pushing the complainant's forehead down while she was already restrained and holding her arm in an awkward enforcement position despite her verbal complaints of pain. Chair Brown noted that other officers on scene used alternative de-escalation techniques, which further informed CPRB's conclusion that Webber's force was not proportional to the threat.

Chair Brown acknowledged that the Chief's Departure provided more explanation than is typical but stated that the Chief's analysis appeared narrowly focused on only one or two elements of the incident, specifically whether the complainant was fully restrained and whether Webber used minimal force. Chair Brown suggested that CPRB's original rationale may not have been fully articulated in a way that captured all factors the Board considered, prompting CPRB to prepare a more comprehensive Final Disposition Letter.

Member Sharp stated that the Chief did not provide clear and convincing evidence sufficient to overturn CPRB's sustained finding. Sharp emphasized that the Chief's rebuttal relied on the same evidence CPRB had already reviewed and did not introduce new information that would justify a departure. Member Willis agreed, noting that the incident was complex and not a "black-and-white" situation. Member Willis supported Sharp's position that the Chief's analysis did not adequately address the broader context of the force used.



OPS Administrator Wenninger provided a detailed explanation of the *Graham v. Connor* standard and Cleveland's objective reasonableness requirements. Admin Wenninger reminded the Board that proportionality, duration of force, available alternatives, officer-to-subject size and strength differences, and the officer's objective must all be considered. He emphasized that reviewers must avoid evaluating force in isolation and instead assess whether the force remained appropriate throughout the entire duration of the encounter.

Member Gatian delivered an extensive analysis of the WCS footage and physical restraint techniques. He noted that the complainant was restrained by multiple individuals, including officers and clinic security, and had been sedated. Gatian stated that the complainant did not bite, spit, or attempt to head-butt anyone, contradicting the Chief's characterization. He described Officer Webber's arm hold as an Americana pain-compliance submission lock, commonly used in MMA, and argued that it was unnecessary given the complainant's condition and the alternative restraint method used by another officer. Member Gatian also pointed out that the Chief's rebuttal relied on still photographs taken at selective moments, which did not accurately represent the full video footage reviewed by CPRB. He concluded that CPRB's original sustained finding was consistent with case law and Cleveland GPOs.

Motion: Upload CPRB's Group Level III sustained finding for excessive force as the chief did not provide clear and convincing evidence to overturn CPRB's finding.

Motion By: Gatian

Seconded By: Vice Chair Miller

Motion Status: Carried

Motion: Impose a 10-Day suspension, the minimum discipline available under the Disciplinary Matrix policy for a Group Level III violation

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Gatian

Motion Status: Carried

VI. Adjournment

Brandon Brown, Chair

Motion: Adjourn September 4th, 2026, Special Virtual CPRB Meeting

Motion By: Gatian

Seconded By: Vice Chair Miller

Motion Status: Carried

- September 4th, 2026, Special Virtual CPRB Meeting was adjourned at 1:2 p.m. EST.



- The next CPRB Meeting will be held in-person located at Cleveland City Hall, 601 E Lakeside Ave, Suite 514, Cleveland, Ohio 44113 scheduled for September 8th, 2026, at 9:15 a.m. EST.